The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CX NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1920 No. 2868

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 813

EDITORIALS:

Harding: Turning Back the Hands of Time 816
The High Cost of Labor 817
System and Strawberry-Crush 818
Hero Worship a la Mode 819

THE "UNBOSSED" REPUBLICAN CONVENTION. By Oswald Garrison Villard 820

"DIRECT ACTION" IN IRELAND. By William MacDonald 822

MR. PALMER AS ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN. By L. E. X. 824

THE HARVEST. By Edward Sapir 825

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By The Drifter 826

BOOKS:

Parliament and Revolution. By Robert Livingston Schuyler 826
Superstition and Surgery. By Preserved Smith 827
Villagers and Others 827
Books in Brief 828

MUSIC:

The New York and Bach Festivals. By Henrietta Straus 829

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 831

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

WILLIAM MACDONALD FREDA KIRCHWEY
ARTHUR WARNER ARTHUR GLEASON
LEWIS S. GANNETT

ERNEST H. GRUENING, MANAGING EDITOR
CARL VAN DOREN, LITERARY EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swarthmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

FIVE European ministries tumbled last week—the German, Austrian, Hungarian, Italian, and Polish. The German elections made a cabinet shift to the Right inevitable, and internal difficulties consequent upon the peace treaties forced the Austrians and Hungarians to readjustments. Indications at the beginning of this week were that the Italians will reinstate as Prime Minister Signor Giolitti, the hated neutralist, who tried to keep Italy out of the war. Giolitti may be counted upon to continue Nitti's liberal European policies, and his record in domestic affairs was one of moderate liberalism. The Polish cabinet which sponsored the Humpty-Dumpty adventure into the Ukraine has met a Humpty-Dumpty fate. Other cabinets may soon be added to the retired list: Millerand in France is likely to fall victim to the intemperate nationalism of Poincaré and Tardieu. But while, since 1917, Europe's shifting political weather has caused an unprecedented array of prime ministers to rise and fall, three, like faith, hope, and charity, abide: Lenin, Venizelos, and Lloyd George.

THE decision of the Supreme Court on the constitutionality of the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead enforcement act could hardly have been more emphatic or thoroughgoing had the passion of the prohibitionists dictated it instead of the reasoning of the justices. As a matter of fact, there was little excuse for thinking that either the Amendment or the enforcement act was unconstitutional. The minority which feels itself oppressed has the right so to feel that belongs to all minorities when the will of the majority has been carried out. It has the right, also, to try by further legislation to change the present law of the land. What the minority may not expect, it appears, is that the phrase "concurrent power" in the Amendment can be interpreted to mean that any important rights are granted to the States in the matter of enforcement. Congress alone has the authority to declare what is and what is not an intoxicating beverage. The outcome, we suspect, will be that after a period of energetic enforcement in all parts of the country a certain diversity of ardor will show itself and those parts of the country which are very "dry" in principle will be very "dry" in fact, while elsewhere the fact will also resemble the principle, and both will be as "wet" as local opinion requires. It will be the legal duty of the majority to prevent such laxness from becoming gross and ridiculous; it will be the moral duty of the majority to show that the accomplishment of their will is the beginning of wisdom.

PERHAPS the Senegalese themselves will settle the vexed question of their employment in Europe's squabbles. By a unanimous display of passive resistance a brigade of black troops, ordered to embark at Marseilles for service in Syria against the Turkish Nationalists, refused to go, and made good their refusal. They all spoke the same formula: "The Gobies [Europeans] will order us to embark, but we will not." They all acted together and acted alike. They are reported to be maintaining discipline, saluting officers, and obeying all orders except the order to set sail for Asia Minor. At Paris, as might be expected, this interesting display of native solidarity is blamed on bolshevist propaganda disseminated on the Rhine, while association by the mutineers with a regiment of Senegalese bound for Africa is suggested as a contributing cause. The fact is, of course, that the black troops have been given as little cause to like Europe as Europe has to like them. Their behavior is doubtless no better than that of other soldiers in other armies of occupation. But their presence in large numbers on German soil and in France itself can have done little to encourage good feeling between the races. The black troops had no interest in or understanding of the tasks imposed upon them; they acted under compulsion, and, finally, instead of allowing themselves to be shipped to other shores to undertake the work of maintaining French influence in Asia Minor, they are saying "that after so long in the French Army they want to go home." Whether the Senegalese are forced at the point of the bayonet to embark or whether the French Government submits, makes little difference in the long run. What stands out plainly is the fact that France will have to use extraordinary methods of recruiting if it intends, as was recently reported, to raise "a black army of at least a half-million men."

"SECRETARY COLBY and Mrs. Bainbridge Colby were the guests of honor at a dinner given last evening by the Russian Ambassador and Mme. Bakhmeteff. Covers were laid for eighteen," reports the society editor of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington *Herald* on June 5. Which may have nothing, and just possibly might have something, to do with the contemporaneous announcement made "in a high quarter" in Washington that "the American Government is maintaining its position of opposition to the reopening of trade with Russia so long as the Soviet leaders remain in power"—however large a share of Russian trade the English and Canadians and Italians may snap up while our State Department maintains its "position of opposition." The interesting question is not whether Boris Bakhmeteff, sometime Ambassador of a Russian Government that died two and a half years ago, has succeeded in gulling Secretary Colby about conditions and trade in Russia—for if he had not, there are hang-overs from a previous regime in the State Department who would have been glad to serve in his stead—but whether Secretary Colby knows that poor old Uncle Sam paid for the eighteen-cover dinner at which he was, we hope, well entertained. For Kerensky has no funds to finance his former representative's dinners, and R. C. Leffingwell, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, is authority for the statement that the expenses of this so-called Russian Embassy have been paid by the American Treasury out of a "war loan" to Russia—which has in fact been used to support anti-Bolshevist propaganda in this country.

"THE feeling is expressed," declares the New York *Times*, "that few persons other than those who have business relations or other connections which bring them into Government circles here are aware of precisely what attitude the United States assumes in regard to Russia. . . ." Tut, tut! Can this be? At any rate the *Times* knows all about our Russian policy, and, interpreting the Department of State most kindly, states it thus: first, the Soviet Government is bound to collapse but no one knows just when this collapse will take place; second, the United States is refusing to recognize the Soviet Government because it has not "met the tests which the United States requires for justification of claims to American recognition by any government"; third, the United States refuses to give its consent to any splitting up of Russian territory by the recognition of new states "established on the ruins of the Russian Empire," except "in the cases of Finland, Poland, and Russian Armenia." Finally, "this Government has not acted on the policy presented to the European Powers because of the inadvisability of taking steps independently of the other countries." All this, of course, while the Krassin-Lloyd George arrangements are going merrily on and many more of the "other countries" are conducting negotiations of one sort or another with Soviet Russia quite irrespective of the United States. It is possible to go on quoting absurdities without end. Will there ever come a time when this sort of nonsense will be relegated to its proper place?

THE striking thing about the Hunter report on disorders in India, examined at greater length in other pages of this issue, is not its cold-blooded detachment or its mild deprecation of massacre. Almost all reports of almost all committees are cold-blooded, and detachment is often their one virtue. The feature of the Hunter report which should stir deep doubt in minds untouched by the virus of imperialism is its calm assumption that British troops in India shall have the permanent right to maintain by force British rule and British "order," even if every Indian must die in the process. Of course, says the report in effect, bombing villages from airplanes sometimes results in the death of innocent persons, and this is deplorable, but in general it is a method we feel called upon to approve. Of course, if people assembled in an illegal gathering refuse to disperse they must be fired upon, but it is worth while even at the expense of several seconds' time to order them to disperse before killing them. Thus have argued tyrants and their apologists in all ages. When the Czar shot down hundreds of peaceful petitioners "illegally assembled" before the Winter Palace in January, 1905, he doubtless argued as the Hunter Committee argues with regard to Amritsar. When the Germans dropped bombs on British babies in English villages they doubtless urged the same necessity that forces British airmen to drop bombs on Indian babies in defenseless villages in the Punjab. The history of atrocity and the history of autocratic military rule are one and the same. And the nation which builds that sort of history, be it Russian or German or British or American, is doomed to the horror of war with its neighbors and to rebellion at home.

MEANWHILE the debate on the Hunter report is being postponed by the British Government for the purpose, according to a dispatch to the New York *World*, of giving "General Dyer a chance of being justified by the Army Council, to which he has appealed for a hearing." This action is taken, says the dispatch, "owing to the practically unanimous feeling among the Coalition Party that Dyer deserves reward instead of censure." It appears, further, that Mr. Montagu, Secretary for India, is not eager for the debate. His position is said to be "compromised by Sir Michael O'Dwyer's statement that he discussed the Indian disturbances fully with him in June, 1919, in London, whereas Montagu publicly declared he had heard nothing of Amritsar until the newspaper disclosures in November." The British Government, reports the *World*, "is anxious to approve Dyer's proceedings, and the effect of such action on Indian feeling alone restrains it." If this be true—and nothing in the history of the present Cabinet would lead us to doubt it—the British Government has passed final and damning judgment upon itself.

THE Allies can thank themselves for the thankless outcome of the German elections. The Peace of Versailles gave German liberalism its death-blow. After-war liberalism in Germany was predicated upon the assumption that acceptance of President Wilson's armistice terms would mean, as he had pledged it would, a treaty based upon the Fourteen Points; and the treaty discredited those in Germany who had held that there was good faith in the Allies and that an attempt to play fair with them would mean a return of the same favor. Nineteen months have passed since the armistice; for Germany they have been months of hunger and cold, of isolation from the world and of inner conflict; of utter misery. A coalition of the moderate and at least relatively liberal elements was in power. The Allies deliberately insulted it and played to discredit it; what wonder that the new elections have strengthened the extremists of both wings? In that nineteen months one group has been proclaiming that only a return to the old nationalism and to the traditional military virtues could save Germany from her low estate; and another group has preached the gospel of salvation by bolshevism. Inevitably

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the moderates in power have been held responsible for much that was really the aftermath of war such as any party would have had to face. They have made mistakes enough of their own in addition; but when they maintained that honest endeavor to execute the treaty would finally bring realization of its impossibility, and that only through confidence in the Allies could Germany ever find the international and only path out of her purgatory, the Allies joined hands with the Prussian Junkers to give the moderates the lie.

IT is a year since the Treaty of Versailles was signed, and the diplomats still talk of enforcing it as if it were the word of God. Like modernist theologians, they admit no changes but some "interpretations." The Turkish treaty is moving faster. Only a month after the presentation of the treaty to the Turkish delegates, the New York *World's* Paris correspondent cables that opposition to its "general tenor"—which sounds rather sweeping—"has become so widespread in France, Italy, and England" (and the lesser allies, including ourselves, no longer count) "that Premier Venizelos may find it a hopeless task to sway back diplomatic opinion"—and there is none but he to try it. The Allies, it seems, are not disposed to encourage the Greeks to "undertake the business of ripping out Mustapha Kemal's nationalist movement and thereby enforcing the San Remo peace terms"—and it is clear that unless someone undertakes to conquer Turkey, those terms can never be enforced. The Turkish treaty was the last word in diplomatic romance. It could no more be translated into reality than Aladdin's lamp, and it might easily become as burdensome to the western world as Sinbad's Old Man of the Sea.

THE jolly mayor of New York, hot with the *hubris* which is natural to him all the year round but which blooms rosiest near the summer solstice, has tucked ivy leaves in his hair, clutched the thyrsus fiercely, and taken the glad Bacchic path into the limelight again. Shall the Russell Sage Foundation rank New York State thirteenth among the States for its schools? No. The jolly mayor thinks they are second to none. The Foundation must stick to its last and not mix with political affairs. Let it be humanitarian still, he says. And now the Federal census has maligned his Manhattan. Who are the shepherds from Washington who have counted the mayor's sheep and found fewer of them than nibbled these soft pastures in 1910? The mayor knows better. No American ever before has waved the crook (the shepherd's crook) over so many Americans in one city before. Let us count noses again. Thus a true shepherd and tribune of the people leads and guards and counts his flock.

POOR Mr. Salteena, who as he was not "musicle" had to entertain the company by asking riddles, might have asked: "Why is Señor Blasco Ibáñez like port?" The Salteenian answer would be: "Because some people think he is improved by shipping." A Rex Beach in his native peninsula, he looks like a Victor Hugo, or maybe a Zola or Tolstoy, in the New World. So he trips it to Mexico and comes back with a basket of cheery scandal for the *Times*. He takes a look at Chicago and finds out—for the *World*—that the Convention sounds and glitters like a bull fight. Well, hay should be made in sunny weather. But what will happen when Señor Blasco Ibáñez goes back to Spain? Something suggests to us—as the Señor is a man of letters—two literary allusions. One is that by and by Alice in Wonderland shrank back to her natural dimensions; the other is that the Genii, who had been as large as a cloud for a moment, subsequently fitted his little box again.

IF you call a soviet by the harmless name of "State legislature," will the great American people swallow the sugar-coated pill? The People's Power League of Oregon, which had a good deal to do with putting over the initiative and the referendum and other reforms that have turned out to be quite innocuous, is making the test. It proposes an amendment to the State Constitution by which the people would elect the members of the Legislature on the basis of the elector's business and home occupations and in proportion to the number engaged in each business. By this method the registered members of each occupation in the State, instead of the registered denizens of each cross-roads or city, would elect men or women to represent them. "Men no more fairly represent women in the Legislature than they formerly represented women at the polls," says the League, and it has its doubts as to how well city lawyers represent farmers. Taking the occupational figures of the census of 1910 as a basis, it reckons that out of every hundred members of the Oregon State Legislature, fourteen should be farmers, fourteen farmers' housewives, five farm laborers, four tenant farmers, four tenant farmers' housewives, twenty town housewives, eight male city manufacturing workers, three male clerks and salesmen, seven railway or transportation workers, five loggers and sawmill workers, three merchants, two manufacturers, three professional men or bankers, two women factory workers, three women clerks, saleswomen, stenographers, or school teachers, one cook, one fisherman, one actor, and one domestic servant. There are those who sniff at our present Congress and State Legislatures and dub them "lawyers' soviets." If you forget that horrid word "soviet," this Oregon plan does sound like horse-sense.

THIS year, with revolution so much in the air, one wonders why some rumbling has not been heard at the foundations of the Institution of the Favorite Son. Why did no one rise up at Chicago last week to defend the rights in the early balloting of small sons of small States against small sons of large States? "If we had some bread," the Utah boss, as things now stand, must say to his Utah son, "we could have bread and butter—if we had some butter." The jest is plaintive. But New York can jest with a straight and even a confident face. Chairman Wadsworth could say to President Butler, before the first vote: "If we can bring New York's 88 into line, we shall make a respectable showing—if we can count on those delegates from Iowa, Connecticut, Porto Rico, and Alaska to trail along." Justice asks why certain loaves should continue to be baked in such large pans.

WHO shall say that the Republican Convention did not usher in a new era for women, that a new day has not dawned, and that the gentler sex has not at last risen to a full and equal place side by side with the veteran political warriors of the male sex? Was it not a woman, Helen Varick Boswell of New York, to whom was assigned the high honor of seconding the nomination of Nicholas Murray Butler—preparatory to the withdrawal of his name?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Harding: Turning Back the Hands of Time

THE only favorable thing to be said about the nomination of Senator Warren G. Harding by the Republicans is that it prevented something worse. Had he not been chosen, it is evident that the prize would have gone either to General Wood at a price of about one and a half million dollars or to Governor Lowden for perhaps half a million. That the nomination was not thus auctioned off, the party owes to Senator Borah. But for him there would have been no inquiry. As he put it in Chicago, one and a half millions is too cheap a price to pay for the Presidency if we are going to sell it. Thanks to his honesty and outspokenness, the country has been saved no little dishonor. But that does not conceal the fact that in selecting Senator Harding the party reverted to type. Harding is the McKinley of 1920, and in mental makeup and point of view stands just about where McKinley did in 1900.

It is an attempt on the part of the Republican leaders to turn back the hands of time, as if nothing had occurred since 1912. They have not only shown no appreciation of the revolutionary changes that war has brought about; they have acted as if the Progressive split had never taken place, as if they had reelected Mr. Taft and were now turning to Ohio for another negative "statesman" to be the safe and sound apostle of business as usual, of business as the master of the country. True, there are some planks in the platform that suggest Progressive influence, but who would believe from it that the whole world is seething, that America is full of unrest and dissatisfaction, that people everywhere are clamoring for relief from economic ills, that they are crying for brave and liberal leadership out of a condition in which many are close to actual suffering while an enormous crop of profiteers and war millionaires fattens at the public's expense?

Plainly the Old Guard was convinced that the country was so outraged by the Democratic maladministration that they could afford to nominate one of the most colorless men in public life. Senator Harding is distinctly a reactionary, not a man who would by himself formulate a reactionary program but a hidebound partisan of the narrowest Republican school, who will react to all the conservative pressure that may be brought to bear upon him. He will always be ready to take orders from the financial masters of the party. In that moment of our history when detailed knowledge of foreign affairs is more necessary than ever before, the Republicans have chosen a man who has only the most superficial knowledge of the outside world. In an hour when the country yearns for the leadership of a man with clear-cut convictions, the Republicans select a man who is credited with only three important speeches since entering the Senate. When the country is so plainly opposed to any more militarism that the Chicago platform makers did not dare to put in a recommendation that the individual States undertake compulsory physical training, the convention was ordered to nominate a staunch advocate of universal military training, of a great navy, and of the largest air-fleet in the world. To big business the nomination will be welcome, for Mr. Harding is precisely of the school that worships the protective tariff and thinks that the first duty of government is to aid and preserve the business man. He is, we repeat, McKinley come to life again and reported proud of the resemblance. The hearty endorsement of Boies Penrose—whom it was good form to anathematize eight years ago as the type of all that was objectionable in our political life—completely characterizes the standard-bearer of 1920. He is, as the Pennsylvania Senator is said to have remarked, the kind who will "stay hitched." He will—to that bossism of which Roosevelt and two defeats could not purge the party. He will be a pliable and easily-handled candidate, and if the leaders are wise they will let him stay at Marion, Ohio, and merely utter sententious platitudes about the glorious party and the still more glorious country. Upon this basis it is quite possible that he will walk off with the Presidency.

But for those Americans who are looking into the future the disappointment will be great. Senator Johnson has his faults and is quite by way of being a politician himself. He is nothing more than a half-liberal and on many questions his vision is dangerously circumscribed. Yet his nomination would have heartened liberals and would have seemed to prove that the efforts of the Progressives in 1912 and in 1916 had not been altogether in vain. The choice of Herbert Hoover would have aroused some popular enthusiasm, based on his administrative ability, his knowledge of the situation in Europe, and on the faith of his followers that his experience fitted him to grapple with our pressing economic problems. Instead, we have merely the fact that the Republican Party reasserts its right to be considered one of the most ultra-conservative parties in existence, and that it is wholly blind to the situation in which the world finds itself today. It capped the Harding climax by nominating for Vice President the Governor of Massachusetts, whose fame is due to an entire misconception of the one act upon which rests his claim to greatness.

The situation thus created is an extremely grave one for American liberals and reformers. We are of the opinion that no man the Republican convention could have chosen could make a success of the office, particularly with such a platform to stand upon. The country is in the grip of great economic forces and no Johnson or Hoover could stay their progress, particularly with another such Congress to deal with. Developments abroad will have more to do with the immediate future of the country than all the political platforms that could be drawn up in America. None the less, the presence in the White House of a forward-looking man would not be without compensations. It would then, at least, be possible to obtain that sympathetic hearing which would go so far to make easier the drear transitional days that are coming. But with Republican reaction in complete control, those liberals who are anxious that the Wilson Administration should not go unwhipt of justice, who believe that it merits defeat in every State, may turn in self-defense to the task of organizing a third party. No self-respecting liberal can vote for Harding, and every American who does so gives his approval to that war with Mexico which the Republican platform, in connection with Mr. Lodge's speech, clearly foreshadows. Finally, to multitudes of Americans this spectacle of the old Republican bosses once more in complete control of a subservient party, and so brazenly defying all aspirations for reform and progress, while licking their chops at the prospect of patronage and perquisites, will be additionally disheartening proof of the breakdown of representative government in America.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The High Cost of Labor

THE lady at dinner says that a second cousin tells her that a certain plumber makes ten thousand a year and drives a Packard. Another lady remarks upon the scarcity and impudence of laundresses. Every one present is uncomplimentary to Pampered Labor; it is agreed that the frightful cost of living is attributable to the unpatriotic workmen who stayed out of the army during the war and demanded their pound of flesh at home. But, of course, there is a depression coming; there will be unemployment and lowered wages, and the workers will resume their place once more—that is, if we remain on our guard against Bolshevism. The dinner table is satisfied; no further investigation seems necessary.

But these are matters of statistical fact; if labor has been profiteering, we should be able to prove it. There are three relevant questions: (1) Is the average worker receiving more than he needs? (2) Have advances in wages been greater than the rise in the cost of living? (3) Are high wages responsible for high prices? Let us see.

The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics in August, 1919, made a study of what it cost to maintain a family of five—a man, his wife, and three children—at a minimum of health and comfort in Washington, D. C. This budget includes the actual necessities of life, and in addition an extra hat and ribbon or two, a little insurance, education, a magazine or a movie once in a while, and such sundries. It is by no means a luxurious standard. It includes no Packard—and no Ford. It implies excellent management. Revised to May, 1920, this budget is $2,533.97 a year. It is not "the American standard of living," but, according to the report, "a bottom level of health and decency below which a family cannot go without danger of physical and moral deterioration." Professor W. F. Ogburn, formerly statistician of the National War Labor Board, calculated a similar budget, on a somewhat stricter basis, for a miner's family in Pennsylvania. Corrected to May, 1920, this totals $2,182.51. A budget prepared in the autumn of 1918 by the Philadelphia Bureau of Municipal Research, on a basis which is much nearer the bare subsistence level than to the minimum of health and comfort, now comes to $2,095.09. We may therefore assume that it takes the family of average size between $2,000 and $2,500 a year to live decently. That means a regular weekly wage, without vacations or unemployment, of from forty to fifty dollars, or a daily wage—at a maximum of 306 days a year—of from $6.50 to $8.15.

Not many wage increases have been granted since 1919. In that year a schedule was made of the earnings per day in 103 different occupations, including all those where, we were told, labor was making exorbitant rates, such as the skilled trades in steel mills, shipyards, and building. Of these occupations only four—shearmen, rollers, blowers, and heaters in the steel plants—were paid at a rate of more than $8 for eight hours. These occupations include only a very small minority of the workers in the steel industry itself, probably not more than five per cent. Only 24 occupations out of the 103 were paid at a rate of more than $6.50 for eight hours. These are largely the more highly skilled in the shipyards, in the building trades, and on the railroads. They certainly do not include more than five per cent of the nation's workers. It is true, of course, that some of these men work more than eight hours and receive overtime; but it is also true that many of them, especially in the building trades, are subject to seasonal unemployment and do not work 306 days a year.

There is much misapprehension in the public mind in regard to overtime. It is true that during the war overtime was accepted as a matter of necessity in various industries, and night and Sunday work were regularly organized. Such workers as were assigned to night shifts generally received a higher rate of pay, and it happened that certain men who were working at night, and also doing a considerable amount of overtime and Sunday work, received a total wage for the week that seemed exorbitant. These few exceptional cases of high earnings received an amount of publicity out of all proportion to their numerical importance. Since the war, night work and overtime have been greatly reduced, and it should be the aim of a sound industrial system to eliminate both as far as possible. Night work admittedly puts a greater strain on the body than day work does. When it is resorted to, the hours should be shorter; and the higher rate of pay should be primarily for the purpose of making up the difference, not of increasing materially the earnings of the worker. Overtime is, of its own nature, abnormal. It ought to be viewed by the public as temporary and the price of special exertion—never as part of the normal total by which the pay of a worker is judged.

We may look at the negative side of this showing: 79 out of 103 occupations, representative of the overwhelming majority of the nation's wage earners, do not earn enough to maintain a family of five "without danger of physical and moral deterioration." Fully a quarter of them are subject to actual undernourishment and overcrowding, and are underclad. Of course, one may say that not every workman has to have three children, and that many do not. Quite true; but these figures show that while rollers, heaters, boilermakers, and plasterers may have three or possibly more children with impunity, painters, steamfitters, linotype operators, brakemen, and a host of others may have three or even fewer children only at the cost of racial and social deterioration. To such "profiteers" our best people hold out the prospect of lowered wages.

Perhaps, however, even though workmen in the mass are not now receiving any too much, their wages have risen sufficiently so that they are responsible for the high prices of commodities. Perhaps our former level of prices depended upon an impoverished working population. In October, 1919, the cost of living, according to the United States Department of Labor, had risen 83.1 per cent over 1913. The figures of the National Industrial Conference Board, a great association of employers, made the increase 82.2 per cent in November. The Department of Labor has just made public figures showing that the present rise is over 100 per cent in many places. Yet only 28 out of the 103 occupations mentioned above received increases of more than 100 per cent for the period. Sixty of them received increases of under 80 per cent. The percentages of increase range as low as 20. That means that without question the majority of wage-earners are not so well off, with respect to the cost of living, as they were before the war. Their "real wages" have actually declined.

So much for the situation of labor. There are more direct means, however, of getting at the relation of wages to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prices. The casual writer assumes that if wages are doubled, prices must be doubled in order to insure the same return to capital. That would be more nearly true if labor cost were anything like the whole cost of production. In any given product, however, labor is likely to be only a small part of the total. In meat packing, for instance, the Census Bureau of Manufacturers shows that labor causes only four per cent of the total expenses of the industry. If meat-workers' wages were doubled, therefore, prices need not be more than five per cent higher than before in order to take up the entire increase. According to a study recently made by W. Jett Lauck [discussed in an article, "Where Your Money Goes," in *The Nation* of June 12], in canning corn, although labor cost increased 22 per cent between 1916 and 1917, the canner's profit increased 256 per cent. These figures are based on the results of an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission.

A similar story is told in textiles. In 1919, out of the price of a yard of blue denim, labor received 4.7 per cent and the mill owners received in profits 24.74 per cent. The labor cost had increased 92.6 per cent since 1910, while the profits had risen a modest 602 per cent. We have heard much of the high wages of the steel workers. The figures quoted, to be sure, refer to only a small proportion of the employees. But the labor cost in operating a blast furnace is not more than 3 per cent of the selling price of pig iron. While the labor cost in making a ton of iron was going up from about 40 cents to about 86 cents, the price went up from $15 to $30. When Mr. Gary raises wages 10 per cent and then raises prices 10 per cent, he turns a pretty penny on the transaction.

It is not necessary to run through the whole list of necessities in order to illustrate the principle further. The object here is not to show that the owners of industry have made shocking profits, but to demonstrate that they are guilty of shocking misrepresentation when they say that high wages are responsible for high prices. The responsibility for prices may not lie wholly upon the profiteers, but at least they could have paid labor considerably more than they did without approaching bankruptcy or raising prices any further. A graphic illustration of this fact is a table drawn up by Mr. Lauck, showing the net incomes of large corporations in basic metal industries, clothing, food, fuel, light and housing, and miscellaneous. It includes only the companies of a million dollars' or more annual income, and is based upon the authoritative financial manuals such as Moody's and Poor's. It takes no account of excessive deductions for depreciation, or sums set aside for tax reserves, or immense increases in salaries, or other methods adopted to conceal the true increase in income. The table shows that the net income of these corporations on their capital for the period was, in 1912-1914, 8.7 per cent—a moderate figure—but that in 1916-1918 it was 23.9 per cent—almost a quarter of the capital. If this were merely a temporary expansion due to the exigencies of the war, we might forget it. But in many cases it is being turned into a permanent burden on the workman and the consumer by increases of capital stock to balance the increased "earning power." The recent numerous stock dividends, exempted even from taxation by decision of the Supreme Court, are riveting about the necks of millions of citizens this heavy yoke.

Yet we are promised lower prices as a result of reduced wages. Reduced wages would bring many American workers to destitution, but they could not materially reduce prices.

System and Strawberry-Crush

THE long-haired poet is an anachronism; the man of letters scorched by the fires of life and art is almost as extinct as the tavern in which he once held forth. Our Latin Quarter is a place of feeble gestures and of furtive hunger for the fleshpots of success. What would we make of a Sainte-Beuve, either the man or the critic? Our poets and novelists and playwrights own motor cars and country houses; they play golf and discuss the coming election. On some of them the varnish of the sound and reliable citizen shows cracks. But they are all busy covering the flaws. Their walk and conversation are one long act of deference to the standards of real estate and wholesale poultry. Though dedicated to so uncommon an activity, they nurse a frantic fear of the abnormal and are the first people in recorded history to attempt the production of literature which they have not first lived.

Youth seems to offer exceptions. But the first thousand dollar check is the beginning of the end. To earn others you must not offend the heavy advertisers who indirectly but implacably control the editorial policy of the great magazines by which such checks are issued. Thus by a process at once brutal and insidious the gentlemen who pay fabulous advertising rates in order to commemorate on gorgeous pages such legends as "Keep your car young!" or "Drink Strawberry-Crush!" contribute their mite toward keeping our literature sane and safe. The recipient of their indirect bounty who once, perhaps, by the lakes of Wisconsin or the yellow waters of the Congaree saw the eternal fevered vision of art, hires a secretary and moves uptown. A house in the country will come later. One can't bring up children in the city. Our man of letters starts a serial. He fortifies himself with strawberry-crush.

A commoner situation is different and more magnificent. Lion and lamb gambol together on the tennis courts. No longer does an irate father—white whiskers, face a bit ruddy from port—disown his wild-eyed offspring who would be a poet. The father has shed whiskers and port and is at peace with his son. If the boy wants to go in for the drama, he proceeds to Harvard; if for the short-story, there is Columbia. The early years may be lean. But so they are in other professions. It is a pity the boy will not go into business. Well, this is a world of trials. And there is, the son assures him, a business side to writing. There are actual trade journals. Take the one that discovered and practically made Jack London. Everybody knows what his income was! In the February number, for instance, there's a corking article by L. Harcourt Farmer called "The Business of Writing." "Listen to this, Dad: 'We know that the men and women who are out to do big stuff, to make a living, have system for their middle name!" Two fingers of the father's efficient hand go up to his youthful, close-clipped mustache. He looks out over the trim lawn. "But how about those parlor Bolshevist writers in New York that you hear about nowadays?" "Aw, they're not in it!" The son is cheery and full of rich assurance. "You never see their names in ——." And he mentions the periodicals to which he aspires. He studies the type of story which each of them affects—big business, heart interest, adventure. He notes plot variations and the niceties of effective structure. He records the results of his observations in a card catalogue. System is his middle name.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LAURA GOULD LIBRARY MEMORIAL LIBRARY

Old discords are silenced. There is peace where there should be a sword. It has come because we are so desperately afraid of losing our lives in order to gain them. Doubtless the history of literature is a sorry one on its economic and, if you will, its moral side. Who would see his son risk the fate of Otway in the London alleys, of Verlaine in jail or hospital? Not the snug citizen of any age. He has never, to be sure, been as careful of life in mines or wars. But that is an old failing of his. It is the son who, today and here, threatens to play us false. It is he who has dared hunger and disease and scorn for the creative vision. If he turns timid and does not hold the world well lost, we had better stop prating about literature.

In the Old South committees of gentlemen used to meet from time to time and finance mighty quarterlies and pass resolutions establishing a Southern literature. We smile at them. But our courses of instruction in creative letters and our trade journals are quite as futile and a bit more vulgar. For the artist, good fellow-citizens, is what he is neither through affectation nor viciousness. Resolutions and courses of instruction will palm off on you but a dreary substitute. Unless he hurts you, he is an impostor. When he crashes through your favorite delusions and deals freely with the stuff of life you fancy fixed and rigid, then you may know he is with you—enemy and outcast of your today, friend and guide of all your tomorrows. Somehow he will conquer for himself both suffering and wine. He cannot live on system and strawberry-crush.

Hero Worship a la Mode

THE torchbearers of new religions have ever been accused—and generally with justice—of mixing fact with fiction. There is no reason, therefore, why the apostles of the Roosevelt religion should be denied this privilege; for even their gospel encounters some opposition. With the lessening hold of the older faiths, there has come a brisk demand for new, and, in a country like America, where the war mind still largely obtains, Roosevelt worship finds ready acceptance. Still the new religion has many competitors: consider the ouija board.

Thus, although the grave at Oyster Bay has in a few months become a shrine to attract thousands of pilgrims, the plan to restore Roosevelt's birthplace as a "national center of Americanism" involves considerable money, to raise which the ways of the medicine man seem to be called for. Somehow the idea has gone out that on one of the busy streets of New York the birthplace of the Rough Rider is still standing and is to be preserved by the Woman's Roosevelt Memorial Association. In the literature that the Association sends out it does not say this, but, accidentally or otherwise, much of its publicity gives this impression and some is definitely inexact. For instance, a sign has been placed over the door at 28 East Twentieth Street which says: "Theodore Roosevelt was born in this house October 27th, 1858, and lived here until he was 13½ years of age." It happens that Roosevelt was not born in "this house" at all. The house in which he was born has been pulled down, and the site is now occupied by a business building. It is proposed to remove this and reerect the Roosevelt home: an ordinary brownstone front of the type so common in the New York of the past century. The Association has also bought the property immediately adjoining on the west (No. 26), where the home of Robert Roosevelt still stands (with slight additions in front). This is to be torn down and replaced by a modern structure, and together with the "restored" birthplace, is to be known as Roosevelt House, the whole to "pulsate with active Americanization." Thus the scheme resolves itself into this, that in order to rebuild a birthplace that no longer exists (and had no artistic claim to be preserved), a modern structure is to be torn down, while, next door, an authentic house of the period is to be demolished and a modern building to take its place.

These facts are set forth not so much in higher criticism of the Roosevelt religion as to suggest certain considerations in regard to historic monuments, particularly birthplaces. Where a building is both historically and architecturally worth while, it should certainly be preserved as long as possible; it is less certain that it should be "restored" when such restoration means entire reconstruction. When a building has historic but not artistic character (like the Roosevelt birthplace), it is doubtful if special effort should be made to preserve it and it is certain that, once destroyed, it should not be rebuilt. In such circumstances a tablet is all that is called for, unless—unless you are proselyting a new religion and need a house of worship which shall "pulsate with active Americanization." Merely to mark with tablets the birthplaces of our great men and women in the future may involve so covering some of our maternity hospitals with plates that they will look like battleships, while still other complications will arise from the habit that modern metropolitan youngsters have acquired of bursting into the world in railway stations, ferry houses, street cars, or ambulances racing to the nearest hospital.

The Woman's Roosevelt Association is for Americanism with punch—a punch for anybody with contrary views; for anybody who does not accept his Americanism in the form of pink pills put up in Washington from a formula furnished by Wall Street. "There must be no sagging back in the fight for Americanism" is its slogan. No, and no talking back either, one imagines. Its rule will be to obey and, in the elegant language of ex-Attorney General Gregory, to keep one's mouth shut.

If one goes today to the street that harbors the window that is part of the front that is in the house that is to be torn down in order to build a birthplace for the head of the Roosevelt religion, he may read on the plate glass these words: "Podolsky & Goldenberg, Woolens and Dress Goods." On the house next door, which is to be included in the reconstruction, he will observe the sign: "Grubman & Eisman, Woolens, Silks, and Velvets." Even though these signs be eradicated, one wonders if they may not prove of more significance to future Americanism than anything with which the Women's Roosevelt Memorial Association may replace them. One asks whether, before "teaching Americanism," as the Association announces it will do, it might not be well to learn something of it from the standpoint of all those thousands of immigrants, more recent than the Roosevelts, who know the pain as well as the joy of Americanization.

Some years ago in France a man applied for a marriage license. Search revealed no record of his birth. The officials answered thereupon that they could not permit the man to marry as legally he had never been born. It would be a pity if, after erecting a "national center of Americanism," the Woman's Roosevelt Memorial Association should discover that Americanism as a tangible, teachable doctrine had not yet been born.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The "Unbossed" Republican Convention

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

Chicago, June 13

"WELL, how do you like having an unbossed convention? You newspaper men have been crying for one all these years. Now that you have it, how do you like it?" These were the words with which the politicians greeted the newspaper fraternity when its members drifted into Chicago on Sunday and Monday. Apparently the bosses were not in control. There was no crystallization of sentiment on any one man. Borah and Johnson were openly defiant, and everybody seemed at sea. But when the convention got down to business it was the same old gang that ran it in the same old way.

Doubtless some of the delegates who were attending a national convention for the first time may have thought that they were having some say about things, but no one else did. When the deadlock between Lowden and Wood, which was inevitable because of the campaign contribution scandals, had been carefully and skillfully brought about, the convention adjourned for a couple of hours. So the newspapers announced; but what that phrase really meant was that the Old Guard bosses—Murray Crane, Senators Brandegee, Smoot, and Lodge, and one or two others went into session on the thirteenth floor of the Blackstone Hotel for a final give and take and awarding of the nomination. It had looked like Harding after the bargaining of the night before, and the convention had not reassembled two minutes before the orders were passed around and the "unbossed" convention knew what it had to do.

There was only one element of uncertainty after daybreak on Saturday, and that was what the Johnson forces might do. There are sound observers who feel that Johnson could have prevented the nomination of Harding and assured that of Knox if he had wished to. That would have been another victory for the irreconcilables of the anti-treaty fight after their success in keeping out of the platform any promise to ratify the existing treaty, but Johnson would not act. Had the vote of California been thrown to Knox on the fourth ballot, Connecticut and Pennsylvania would, it is said, have followed suit, but from the beginning the Johnson candidacy was as badly handled as if the Senator himself were the veriest novice in politics. Even on Monday there was no plan of campaign worked out and no floor manager appointed. While the Senator was engrossed with the platform fight, there was no strong man to canvass the delegation for him and fight for his nomination. When he had gained his compromise resolution on the treaty, which was hardly worth fighting for, the bosses felt sure of him. Besides he had made the grave tactical mistake of saying weeks before the convention that he would not bolt if not nominated.

Senator Borah, on the other hand, helped to defeat both Wood and Lowden by threatening to bolt as late as Friday night. Neither was nominated. Borah's speech on the front pages of the Chicago newspapers of Saturday morning materially helped the bosses to reach their decision not to take either of the leaders in the voting. But Johnson not only deprived himself of this advantage of threatening a bolt, but chose as spokesman Charles Wheeler, of San Francisco, than whom no one could have made a worse nominating speech. He has the reputation at home of being an eloquent speaker. He succeeded only in driving delegates away from Johnson. Every moment that he spoke made matters worse for the Californian for whom he appealed, so the Johnson candidacy collapsed in sad fashion, unworthy both of the man and his cause; the Senator did not even use his delegates to prevent the pitifully weak ending of the whole struggle.

Surely no candidate ever nominated by a great party received as little cheering in the convention which voted him the honor as came to Harding. There was no enthusiasm whatever, except in the Ohio delegation, after one roar of joy that the end had come and with it relief from the torture of sitting hours at a time in that torrid depressing atmosphere of the Coliseum, the thousands in the galleries stood in utter silence. It was not only the natural disappointment of the followers of Hoover, Wood, and Lowden, who filled the spectators' seats; it was also the realization that there was nothing in the successful man's personality to make anybody's heart beat quicker.

"How can any man go out and make a ringing speech about as cold a proposition as that?" said a young Minnesota delegate after adjournment. Indeed the shock to the audience may best be described as like the feeling of disappointment in a close football game that ends in a tie when one team is within six feet of the goal line. There was plenty of enthusiasm waiting to be let loose in the Coliseum, but no one to give it to. And thus ended what was from first to last one of the dreariest and most discouraging party gatherings ever held.

Aside from the fight to keep the party from promising to ratify the peace treaty with its reservations, the only question of interest during the week was whether Ivory soap money or Pullman car money would carry off the nomination. Despite many signs to the contrary, many of the veteran correspondents here refused to believe that there was ever any real chance of Wood or Lowden winning the fight. On Monday night at the Johnson rally in the Auditorium a Lowden sympathizer interrupted Senator Borah in favor of Lowden. Before the Senator could answer another man called out: "Did you get two thousand five hundred dollars to say that?" During the convention, on one ballot the Missouri delegation declared its unreadiness to vote. "Give 'em time," called a spectator, "they are counting the cash." Not even the Old Guard would have dared to go into a campaign in which things like this would have been said every time a meeting was had on behalf of either Lowden or Wood. The thing was just a bit too raw.

But, as it was, money was written all over the convention. It would have been impossible to throw a stone into any group of men without hitting a banker. One wondered after a visit to the Blackstone how business could be going on in Wall Street when so many of its most distinguished figures were in Chicago. No one will of course deny that a banker has as much right as anybody else to attend a party convention, but if one is aware of the feeling abroad as to the relationship between bankers and political campaigns, it is undoubtedly the part of political wisdom not to have every single firm on State or Wall Street too con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spicuously represented or by too many partners. Special privilege, big business, great wealth was everywhere in evidence in the gathering. There was not a man anywhere who looked as if he earned his living by the sweat of his brow, though there were farmer delegates. But this was emphatically a gathering of those to whom the gods have dispensed the favors of the earth, and the leaders showed it by the indifference with which they greeted the demands of labor and farmers. True, Mr. Gompers in an able speech kept the platform committee from indorsing the Henry Allen court device to prevent strikes, but the committee came out with a plank opposing strikes by public employees, but offering no constructive suggestion as to what such employees should do when just demands were ignored. This plank was more loudly cheered by the delegates than any other, with the exception of the one calling for the registration of aliens annually until naturalized, after careful tests as to their having absorbed Simon-pure Americanism.

Fortunately there is a plank for freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly for which credit goes to Senator Medill McCormick, who also fought well for the treaty plank. To William Allen White the party owes those planks which smack of what used to be called "social justice." But in the main the document represents the usual compromises, with the usual number of weasel words, especially in the plank relating to the treaty, which each faction is interpreting according to its own point of view. The one refreshing incident was the minority report presented by E. J. Gross of Milwaukee. This was the second time that he has had the courage to do this. Four years ago he similarly rose in meeting, but this year the "unbossed" assembly which he confronted was less tolerant than that of 1916. When he demanded that the convention take a stand as to the peace treaty which was not open to misunderstanding, the delegates listened glumly; but when he went on and outlined some radical doctrines such as the taking over of the stock yards and railroads there was pandemonium. Evidently Chicago is particularly determined that none but private ownership shall have the credit of its beloved stock yards. "Throw him out, Mr. Lodge," bellowed a man next to me. "He is an anarchist and a socialist." Mr. Lodge stood up for Mr. Gross's right of free speech manfully, but the delegates and the audience liked Mr. Gross no more than they did the rest of the Wisconsin delegates whom they booed and hissed and jeered when 24 out of 26 voted for Robert La Follette from first to last and refused to make the vote for Harding unanimous. Wisconsin did not belong in "unbossed" conventions like this one. It proposes to think for itself when and where it pleases. Perhaps it understands what effect the Harding nomination will have upon the progressive voters of the Northwest. At any rate the convention made it clear that it considered Mr. Gross's having views of his own most disgusting impudence.

Certainly there was no other Progressive to speak. Gifford Pinchot was in Chicago and so were Mr. Garfield and Raymond Robins and lesser Bull Moose lights. Some twenty-five of them dined on Monday night, together with the young Roosevelts, just to recall the good old days, but that was as far as matters went. The bosses had Borah and Johnson to worry about, but no one else. How they do hate this group—attributing to it precisely their own attitude and desire to rule or ruin.

A far more satisfactory type of the progressive is William Allen White, who after making his fight in the resolutions committee was willing to cast his vote rightly when the orders came for Harding.

In one matter the Harding managers showed excellent common sense. Four years ago it was rumored that when the convention met, Harding would prove to be the dark horse. I well remember with what trepidation those who were working for the Hughes nomination awaited Harding's keynote speech, lest he stampede the convention in the manner of Bryan. Nothing could have stirred the pulses less. Harding's keynotes, if not flat, were at least extremely pianissimo, and the writer of these lines hurried off a dispatch to the New York *Evening Post* recording Harding's failure to impress anybody with his wisdom or ability. This time the Harding managers saw to it that Harding made no speeches nearer to Chicago than Columbus, Ohio. As for Coolidge, that myth has a tremendous hold upon the delegates. They think of him as another rugged and brave Grover Cleveland defying the lightnings of labor, and Oregon hurried to nominate him for Vice-President, an honor that his own State seemed slow to wish to bestow. The nomination received a far more spontaneous and enthusiastic roar of approval than Harding got at any time. It was rather comical to watch the faces of the Massachusetts newspaper men. Knowing their Governor, there was not a shadow of exultation or a visible bit of State pride, and their conversation was chiefly an eulogy of Coolidge luck.

It only remains to record one of the humors of the convention, and that is the fact that Roosevelt has now taken his place by the side of Lincoln as one of the party saints whom every speaker must mention at least twice. Four years ago no one dared mention his name lest the delegates break away from the bosses and stampede to him. Now he is safely sanctified. His former "base treachery" is entirely forgotten and the numerous savory epithets, such as horse thieves and second-story men, which he hurled at his party associates are completely overlooked. And quite the most interesting incident of the convention was the able speech made by Mrs. Robinson, Roosevelt's sister, for General Wood. Like the other women speakers, she held up the men to shame with her brevity and effectiveness.

What an opportunity this Republican fumbling gives the Democrats at San Francisco need not be stressed. They need only take Mr. Gross's minority report to prove the unprogressiveness of their opponents, and there are many other vulnerable points offered to them by the acts of the Republican apostles. A week ago it seemed as if the Republicans would have an absolute walk-over. Today the Democrats seem to have a fighting chance if they play their cards well. It is possible that they will be powerfully aided should La Follette decide to run on the third ticket which will be put into the field the middle of July. But without anticipating that, the facts are that the "unbossed" Republicans have left Chicago for home after having alienated organized labor and the suffragists, both surely to be reckoned with in November, disappointed the various racial groups who had been more than ready to enlist, and chilled the enthusiasm of the considerable Progressive elements. For the liberals who remained hopefully within the party, whether under the banners of Johnson, Hoover, or even Leonard Wood—believing him to be Roosevelt's reincarnation—will find it difficult if not impossible to vote for Harding and the money bags and bosses who will direct his well-disciplined mind. Perhaps, after all, the convention was useful—it will hasten the American people's awakening.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Direct Action" in Ireland

By WILLIAM MacDONALD

Dublin, May 14

THAT there is grave and widespread disorder in Ireland has become a commonplace of Irish news; that the disorders have greatly multiplied of late is a matter of common observation. I have before me as I write the official lists of "disorders" which for the past two weeks have been issued daily by the military authorities of Dublin Castle for the information of the press. The items of these lists, varying in number from twelve or fifteen to twenty-five or thirty per day, include the killing or wounding of constables or police, the burning of police barracks, armed attacks in force upon police stations, the robbery of mails in transit or at post offices, cattle driving, the ousting of tenants from their farms, compulsory sales or promises of sales of land held by large proprietors, the looting of schoolhouses and churches, the destruction of income tax records, intimidation of office-holders or of candidates for office in the approaching local elections (a number of the latter being forced to withdraw), raids upon private dwellings for arms, and armed assaults upon private individuals. During the past twenty-four hours, as the fruit of the most extensive concerted outbreak which has thus far occurred, sixty-eight disused police barracks have been destroyed, twenty-five income tax offices raided, and several court-houses burned. Five inquests over the killing of policemen were in progress yesterday. The outrages, while mainly confined to Sinn Fein Ireland, have spread also to Ulster, where Sinn Fein adherents are numerous and, apparently, increasing.

The question of the police is one which, I think, is not clearly understood in America. In the usual American sense there are no police in Ireland. The Dublin Municipal Police, the maintenance of which is a charge upon the municipality and for whose support the property of citizens may be distrained if the necessary tax is not levied and collected, goes through the accustomed forms of directing street traffic and preserving law and order. It is a sturdy-looking body of men, apparently of as decent a sort as is usually to be found in English or American cities. In fact, however, it is an armed force under military discipline, controlled entirely from Dublin Castle, and performing for the Government the hateful services of spying and political espionage. Outside of Dublin there are no local police whatever, their place being taken, to the small extent to which it is taken at all, by the Royal Irish Constabulary. The R. I. C., as it is familiarly called, resembles a police force only in its uniform; in reality it is, like the Dublin Municipal Police, a military body controlled by Dublin Castle. During the day its members, who are likely to be seen at every railway station, on the streets of the larger towns, and now but rarely anywhere else, wear side-arms prominently displayed; at night they carry carbines. They live in barracks, most of which are now fortified; there will be several such barracks in a large town, and there are hundreds scattered over the country. Most of the members of the force are Irish, no member, however, being allowed to serve in or near the county to which he belongs; of late an attempt has been made to induce ex-service men to join the force. So great is now the fear in which they live as the result of the ceaseless attacks upon them that they have practically ceased to patrol the country districts; by day they commonly go about by twos or threes, while at night, if they venture out of their barracks at all, they will be seen only in bodies of from six to twelve or more. In an extensive tour about Ireland I have only once or twice seen a single policeman on duty in the daytime.

Were it not for the fact that Ireland, in spite of a popular impression to the contrary, is under normal conditions an exceptionally law-abiding country, the absence of a local police force of the ordinary kind might be expected to open the way to widespread lawlessness and crime. In point of fact, however, there is extremely little crime in Ireland, in either town or country, save such as is political in its origin. The crowds which throng the streets at night I found everywhere quiet and orderly. Even at Waterford, which has a "rough" quarter, and where numerous boarded-up windows with shattered glass still bear witness to the destructive work of a mob which broke loose for a time following the general strike of April 12-14, the record of ordinary misdemeanor is slight; and Cork, where if anywhere, perhaps, a spirit of lawlessness might be expected to find support, is a law-abiding city. In Dublin, on the other hand, where a rigorous curfew law, ostensibly proclaimed as a precaution against crime, bars civilians from the streets between midnight and five in the morning, and where the police patrol during those hours is reinforced by soldiers in armored cars, there has been of late an alarming increase of robbery and burglary.

It is easy to understand why those who, in Ireland, ardently desire independence and believe in using violence and "direct action" to attain it, should attack the police. To them the police, whether in Dublin or elsewhere, represent not the law-and-order sentiment of the community, but the British rule which they denounce as illegal and unjust, and whose harsh and odious methods of repression they have only too keenly suffered. To the average Irishman, whether Sinn Feiner or not, the policeman is a spy; he is one of the eyes and ears of Dublin Castle. He stands as the willing servant of a Government which has raided houses by day and by night, to the accompaniment of tanks and armored cars, in its search for arms, papers, or political suspects; which has filled the jails of Ireland and England with Irish political prisoners against whom no charges have yet been made nor incriminating evidence adduced; which has suppressed throughout Ireland practically every newspaper, magazine, club, society, or organization which supported, however indirectly, the program of Sinn Fein; which prohibits Sinn Fein public meetings and discussion while permitting treason to be openly talked in Ulster; which has filled the island with civilian and soldier spies; which has dallied with the settlement of the land question; and which continues to derive a substantial revenue from Ireland notwithstanding its gross misgovernment. To people imbued with such sentiments the members of the Dublin Municipal Police and of the Royal Irish Constabulary are to be gotten rid of at any cost. They are being murdered in broad daylight on the streets of the towns; shot at from hiding-places at night, ambushed and done to death when going in companies on country roads, attacked with rifles,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

machine guns, and explosives in their barracks; and now that some of them wear breastplates to break the force of bullets, their deadly enemies shoot them in the back.

Yet I am still compelled to think, strange as the opinion may seem to some, that there is as yet in Ireland nothing properly to be called a reign of terror. The shooting of policemen would almost certainly cease if the Government were to alter its tactics. There is no general hatred of the troops, some thirty or forty thousand of whom are scattered about the country, and whose main purpose appears to be to protect the hounded police. One may travel freely and safely anywhere in Ireland, professing meantime any political sentiments one pleases, without fear of interference. Neither Protestants nor Unionists as such run any risk of bodily harm or of attacks upon their property. The landowners and tenants who have been attacked or have had their cattle driven from the ranches into the highway are, with few exceptions, men who have either refused to sell pasture land for tillage in the face of a fair offer to purchase or who have occupied farms in regard to which some old dispute was still rankling. That the lawlessness which at the moment is directed against certain limited classes may, however, degenerate before long into something akin to general terrorism is, I think, extremely probable; for the temper of three-fourths of Ireland is badly strained, and violence grows with that which it feeds upon.

To what extent, if at all, is Sinn Fein responsible for the various forms of lawlessness and the grave acts of crime which are coming more and more to prevail? The question cannot be answered summarily. To begin with, Sinn Fein is not a unit, nor is it the only body which is exerting itself to break off Ireland from the Empire. Within the organization of Sinn Fein there are two well-marked factions. One, of which the leading representatives are Mr. De Valera and Mr. Arthur Griffith, is pacifist. It does not believe in violence as a proper means for the attainment of independence. On the other hand, a considerable element in Sinn Fein rejects pacifism as a mode of procedure, and advocates aggressive and, if necessary, violent methods for the attainment of its ends. That there is the likelihood of a definite split in the organization over this issue I am not able to say; but the two factions stand in rather sharp opposition the one to the other, and the most recent course of events seems to indicate that the advocates of force are attaining ascendancy. Outside of Sinn Fein is the Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood, a secret organization of whose personnel and operations even Sinn Fein itself knows little save that many of the members are also members of Sinn Fein. That the Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood as an organization is responsible for a good deal of the lawlessness which now prevails, many Sinn Feiners incline to believe. Undoubtedly, too, such lawless elements as exist in Ireland, small in numbers as they probably are, have been encouraged by the political struggle which is going on, and have little hesitation in calling themselves Sinn Feiners whether they are such or not.

Nevertheless, the official reports of outrages which are issued daily from Dublin Castle almost invariably take the form, when discussed in Parliament or in the Unionist press, of reports of misdeeds for which Sinn Fein is responsible. Why, then, does not Sinn Fein deny responsibility for them? I have asked that question of a number of Sinn Feiners. The reply of one of them may be quoted as representing the general attitude toward the question:

Why should Sinn Fein go to the trouble of issuing a denial? Why should not the Presbyterian Church or the Irish Transport Workers Union be held as responsible as Sinn Fein? The British Government has not turned over to Sinn Fein the business of enforcing law and order in Ireland. When it does, we will do our best to put a stop to disorder of every kind; but until it does, we are under no obligation to go before the public with a statement, especially since the statement would not be believed even if we made it.

The argument is ingenious, but it obviously is not convincing. I have no reason for believing that any of the outrages which have lately been taking place in Ireland have been either suggested, or planned, or carried out with the official approval of Sinn Fein. If there be an exception, it is the attacks upon the police barracks; as for the killing of policemen, most Sinn Feiners are Catholics, and religion is an appreciably restraining influence when it comes to the deliberate planning of murder. I cannot but think, however, that Sinn Fein as a whole, and particularly the faction which believes in "direct action," is entirely willing to appropriate any political or other advantage which may be expected to result from effective terrorizing of proscribed individuals or classes; and that, so long as it makes no denial, it must accept a measure of moral responsibility for the crimes that are committed in its name or in aid of the agitation which it carries on. On the other hand, it is by no means clear that Sinn Fein could now stop the outrages even if it were disposed to try. Doubtless it could stop some of them, for its power is great and its authority is, in general, respected. There is reason for suspecting, however, that the advocates of violence have so far gained the upper hand as to make interference with them difficult, and that, for the time being at least, outrages may tend to increase both in number and in gravity.

The British Government, on its part, seems disposed to meet force with force in approved British fashion. The troops in the island are being constantly added to, and several bodies of cavalry have lately been sent over. The streets of Cork are now patrolled day and night by soldiers as well as by policemen, and although martial law has not been proclaimed, the city is practically under martial law and its mayor is "on the run." On Wednesday, guards of soldiers appeared at the Custom House and other public buildings in Dublin. The city of Dundalk is patrolled by soldiers. The "new policy" for Ireland, to which the newspapers have for some days been alluding in vague terms, seems likely to be not one of conciliation, but one of blood and iron. What the 200,000 men who are said to be enrolled in the Irish Volunteer army will do in the face of an avowed attempt at military subjugation remains to be seen, but the hope of a peaceful solution of the difficulty grows dimmer with each passing day. Whether, under the circumstances, Sinn Fein may still hope to succeed is a question which I must leave for a following letter.

In next week's issue

Will Sinn Fein Succeed?
By William MacDonald

The A. F. of L. Convention
By Arthur Gleason

Important issues before the Convention were still under discussion at the time of going to press. Therefore, this article, originally announced for June 19, has been postponed until next week.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Palmer as Alien Property Custodian

By L. E. X.

IN his address to Congress of April 5, 1917, the President stated that we would "conduct our operations as belligerents without passion and ourselves observe with proud punctilio the principles of right and of fair play that we profess to be fighting for," and "in a high spirit of right and fairness because we act without animus." While it has long become painful to honest Americans to quote Wilson's speeches and promises, it may not be without interest to call attention to the record of his lieutenant, A. Mitchell Palmer, as Alien Property Custodian, in carrying out the noble behests of his distinguished chief. Bearing in mind Mr. Palmer's remarkable transgressions of law in his pursuit of the Reds, we shall more readily appreciate his accomplishments in discovering and "stamping out" a no less mythical "German industrial menace," without apparent concern for the legality of the measures he adopted. For, as he has said in this connection, "self-preservation . . . has no limits other than the existence of the emergency," a doctrine strikingly resembling the German defense that "necessity knows no law." The doctrines he has enunciated and put into practice should give concern to every American business man and investor in foreign countries.

On October 6, 1917, Congress created the office of Alien Property Custodian, to which Mr. Palmer was appointed two weeks later. That he was fully aware of the fundamental principle of modern international law that the private property of enemy citizens is not subject to confiscation or dissipation, is indicated by his announcement in the Official Bulletin of November 14, 1917, No. 159:

> The purposes of Congress are to preserve enemy-owned property in the United States from loss and to prevent every use of it which may be hostile and detrimental to the United States. . . . The Alien Property Custodian exercises the authority of a common law trustee; there is no thought of a confiscation or dissipation of property thus held in trust.

Not many months afterwards, however, when valuable property and money had found its way into his hands, temptation and zealousness overcame him, and he began to advocate a policy looking to the confiscation and dissipation of the property, justifying his proposals on various grounds, for the most part conceived in the vivid imagination which more recently developed for our country the "Red plots."

Although he realized that he was a "common law trustee" and therefore under the strictest duty to preserve the property intact, he soon began to advocate and obtained Congressional authority for the sale of the most valuable property to American citizens. A move "necessary to protect the property and to prevent waste" was his first explanation, but his real purpose, in complete violation of his trust, is indicated by the statement that "under this Amendment [conferring the power of sale] it has been possible for the Alien Property Custodian to make a big start in the work of divorcing German capital from American industry." To justify this ruthless program of spoliation, a general policy which England, France, and Italy had carefully avoided, he drew the following stirring picture:

> The industrial invasion of America was a studied effort on the part of Germany to make effective her plan to colonize, subdue, and control the world. . . . After a large bulk of this enemy property had come under one hand and we were able to piece together the picture of Germany's industrial aggression during the last forty years, there came . . . a fuller realization of Germany's hostile investment in America.

The Germans were doubtless astonished to find their investments in American industry, which had been welcomed and encouraged by a nation needing foreign capital, thus characterized. But when, by Mr. Palmer's own figures, the actual German investment is revealed at about six hundred million dollars, or only one-fifth of one per cent of our national capital wealth of three hundred billions, the discovery of a "German industrial menace" and a "knife at the throat of America" seems difficult to reconcile with a normal mind. One may recall the indignation of American oil and mining interests at language of similar import used by Mexican politicians to American investors. With the growth of American investments abroad, it may, in due time, with Palmer's report as a precedent, be used against us by other excitable countries.

Mr. Palmer then found that to make the businesses of which he had despoiled the original investors useful to their American purchasers he would have to obtain authority for "taking over" the patents owned by the enemy citizens. He "discovered," as he says, that

> Germans had taken out thousands of American patents upon articles produced under similar patents in Germany, for the sole purpose of preventing the manufacture of the patented article in this country, and thereby forcing the importation of the German product into the American markets.

This happens to be the usual purpose of a patent monopoly, protected by the Berne convention, by treaties, and by the municipal law in all industrial countries. What protection would American manufacturers and inventors have if their foreign patents could not obtain for them exclusive control of their invention?

But the armistice of November 11, 1918, found much German property still unsold. So, disregarding the advice of the ablest international lawyers that all forms of hostilities were, as a matter of law, suspended, Mr. Palmer "carried on." Sales of German investments have continued to the present time. This belligerent reprisal after hostilities had officially and legally ceased is a violation of all known international practice.

With the intentions he had manifested, it followed that this "trustee" should presently openly repudiate his legal duty carefully to conserve the property in his charge. He says officially:

> No greater favor could have been shown to Germany than by carefully managing and conserving these enemy properties as against the time when at the conclusion of the war . . . the former owners could take up the invasion of American industry and commerce on the very salient which they had driven in before the war. And by the same token, a counter thrust of no mean force was directed upon the enemy when we began thoroughly to Americanize those industries. We gave notice that it would be necessary for German capital at least to start all over again in its effort to get a foothold upon American industry and commerce . . . [Germany] was made to realize that when America goes to war she strikes the enemy wherever he raises his head, and the industrial and commercial army

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

built by the enemy on American soil suffered from the same kind of destructive assaults which staggered the Prussian guards on the front line. . . .

When the Congress passed the amendment giving the Custodian the general power of sale, it was with the purpose in mind that the German industrial army on American soil should be captured and destroyed. I have proceeded with all expedition possible to this end. Instead of permitting myself to become a mere conservator of enemy property, I have tried to make the trading-with-the-enemy act a fighting force in the war. . . . It is safe to say that the business which the Germans built up in America will be forever lost to them. No other course is compatible with the safety of American institutions. No other course will make the American field of industry and commerce "safe for democracy."

Not satisfied with the high purposes thus revealed Mr. Palmer presently added a further justification—kindness to the enemy, to wit:

To turn over the German property in this country to its former owners in kind, would be in effect a confiscation of the property, for the bitter resentments accruing from this awful war are such that human nature would have to be reconstructed before the German would be welcome as a business man upon American soil, within the next decade at least. If an American corporation whose stock is owned by German subjects were turned back tomorrow to the control of its former owners, its business would melt away, its assets would shrink, and its former good-will as a going business would become a distinct liability. The German investor would save little out of the resulting wreck.

So the Alien Property Custodian's act in doing the wrecking himself is in reality an act of good-will! Finally feeling the necessity for justifying his far-reaching acts of spoliation, he asserted that Germany had acted in like manner with American property. He states:

She has done just as we have done, keeping constantly a little ahead of us and protesting that she has resorted to liquidation and sale only as a matter of reprisal. With this excuse, she liquidated or sold American property before the general power of sale was conferred on the Alien Property Custodian by Act of Congress. She has sold the property of American and neutral residents in Germany, down to household goods and wearing apparel, which has never been done here.

I do not know where Mr. Palmer got his information. It is said that an American woman returning from Germany made some of the charges above quoted. But I do know that an examination of German legislation and administrative decrees, backed by an investigation in Germany, stamps the statement just quoted as unfounded in fact. That Mr. Palmer knew its falsity in February, 1919, when he made his annual report, is undoubted. As an American, I wish the statement were true, for it would perhaps mitigate our own lawless disregard of the established immunity of private property on land from hostile assault. While Germany did appoint comptrollers and compulsory administrators of all enemy businesses, most of these concerns were permitted to operate as before, including some of the great oil and harvester machinery companies. Legislation had given the German Alien Property Trustee *authority* to liquidate businesses operated to the military disadvantage of Germany, in reprisal for similar allied acts, but this power appears to have been sparingly exercised, and, with respect to American property, practically not at all. The American property in Germany, with trifling exceptions, seems to have been kept intact. We need not attribute this self-restraint to any inherent German respect for law, but merely to ordinary intelligence which realized that any lawless measure against private enemy property in Germany would redound to the great disadvantage of the much larger amount of German property abroad, a very practical reason which induced Mr. Palmer to refrain from seizing Turkish and Bulgarian property here. But the fact that Germany would probably have pursued the same policy as Mr. Palmer had it profited her to do so, even if admitted, neither justifies our own disregard of the rights of private property—protected indeed by the Treaty of 1828 as well as by international law—nor does it strengthen our case, any more than Germany's political case is strengthened by her assertion that if Germany had not violated Belgian neutrality France would have.

The Treaty of Peace has adopted Mr. Palmer's suggestion empowering the Allied nations to appropriate enemy private property to liquidate the claims of the Allies and allied citizens against Germany. Nevertheless Congress still has the power to withhold its assent from our participation in this violation of international law, and for the welfare and security of the American investor and business man abroad it is to be hoped that Congress will show more foresight than the Executive. Should the revolutionary doctrines of Mr. Palmer prevail, an American investment abroad will become a precarious asset, made so, curiously enough, by the very government which is now exerting every effort to encourage it. The stability of international commerce and the mobility of capital would be seriously impaired, whereas common sense dictates their promotion. The country needing foreign capital, like Italy, would be greatly handicapped by such a return to the barbarous practices of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the investing country ought to be the last to support such an unwise policy. It makes disarmament more remote than ever, for not only the integrity of public, but of private property, would depend upon success in arms. Moreover, at a moment when a prodigious world movement questions the very principle of private property, it excites wonder that opponents of that movement should so greatly encourage it by their own manifestation of contempt for the sanctity of private property. The true lover of America, who accepted with pride the announced principles governing our participation in the war, including our purpose of defending international law, must blush with shame on reading Mr. Palmer's report as Alien Property Custodian.

The Harvest

By EDWARD SAPIR

Pipe-smoke is floating over his slow speech.
I love this grizzled farmer's gentle voice;
It hints to me, "I have known to walk and rejoice
In the corn, in the hay, where the sun and the sharp rain teach
By turns; and twelve moons and the weathers, O each
Has fingered my patient heart, like little boys
That fondle and batter their silent, submissive toys."
I love this voice and the pauses of broad reach
That space his words out like a peaceful village,
House-dotted on a prairie of full-ripe tillage,
And smoke-trails weave with the wind along to a bluer
Height. . . . We are sitting bent over embers; now fewer,
Lower, come words. . . . There comes a snow-wind pillage
And the black earth is dead, but the harvest sure.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Driftway

THE Drifter has acquired a backyard, in a barren region where backyards are few and far, and therefore to be prized. It is evident that the previous master prized his backyard highly, for he surrounded it with high board fences armed with iron spikes, and super-armed with barbed-wire barriers. But baseballs penetrate even such hardy defenses, and where baseballs go, small boys somehow follow. Now the Drifter has a city-dweller's passion for a garden, and as soon as the Lady of the House's first demands for a shelved and linoleumed kitchen, and curtain-poled windows, and towel-racked bathroom were satisfied, the Drifter bought him a fork and a rake and a trowel, and a watering-can and seeds, and set to work to make him a garden. Much against the advice of Sandy the furnace-man, and of all the other tenants and ex-tenants, he accepted the assistance of an army of small boys and small girls.

* * * * *

THE Drifter became a figure in the street. He was hailed with enthusiasm whenever he sallied forth to buy a loaf of bread and as he returned from work. He felt what political candidates must feel when the waiting multitudes cry "There he is" and press forward to shake the great man's hand. His backyard became the Utopia of the street urchins, and the privilege of watering his invisible seeds or raking his impermeable clay was a matter to be fought for. The first night the Drifter thought of himself as a sort of super-Tom Sawyer, standing idly by while the proletariat toiled at his direction. But he discovered that there were some tasks for which no bids were forthcoming, and others too highly prized. The wielding of the watering-can was the most fiercely contested privilege, for it involved the right to enter the house to draw more water, and that, as the Drifter soon discovered, meant the opportunity to play tag from furnace to skylight, and to track mud through every corner of the halls. But there were no contestants for the task of removing the bricks and broken bottles which the Drifter uncovered whenever he dug deep to prepare his soil for carrots and cosmos.

* * * * *

A CLAMOROUS army, all demanding the favored task and resenting suggestion of bricks and bottles, besieged the Drifter. He was accused of favoritism in assignment of tasks; his popularity began to wane. Furthermore he learned that there were factions in the street. He had admitted the Irish to his backyard, and the Italian army pounded at his door demanding equal rights. He granted equal rights, and they were disastrous to his seed-beds. The Drifter lost his temper, and drove out the contending armies.

* * * * *

NOW he knows the sorrows of the has-been. He is still recognized as he passes through the street, but no storm of enthusiasm greets his approach. Small boys individually find their way over the spikes and through the barbed wire in pursuit of errant baseballs, but no army is permitted in his backyard. Sandy, the furnace-man, and the other tenants and ex-tenants jeer at him and say "I told you so." The Drifter does his own watering and raking, and removes the bricks and broken bottles unaided. The soil is rather poor anyway; he is not sure that it is fitted for a garden.

THE DRIFTER

Books

Parliament and Revolution

Parliament and Revolution. By J. Ramsay Macdonald. Thomas Seltzer.

WHATEVER other merits may be claimed for literary offensives against Bolshevism launched from the Right, it must be admitted that they have no missionary value. They may, indeed, confirm the opinions and preconceptions of those whose faith in the *status quo* needs no strengthening, but this is a work of supererogation. They do not convert revolutionists. It is doubtful if all the philippics that have been hurled by conservatives at the Bolsheviki have softened the hue of a single "red."

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald's "Parliament and Revolution" belongs in a different category from these. It is a defense of the democratic and parliamentary method of socialist reform as contrasted with the method of which Lenin is the most conspicuous example. It may convert some revolutionists, but it is not intended to convert them to the ranks of social content. Mr. Macdonald belongs to the Left, and he shows as little mercy as Lenin himself to the capitalist system. He agrees with the revolutionists that political democracy under an economic regime of capitalism is capitalist and that parliamentary government has fallen into discredit because democratic majorities are today the creation of capitalist minorities. But he dissents from their conclusion that revolution is the only remedy. He challenges the theory of the revolutionists that the new wine of socialism is due to burst the old bottles of capitalism in a cataclysmic fermentation; for, he says, "whether society uses its powers or not it undoubtedly has the faculty of changing its bottles with its wine." He is opposed to copying Lenin's methods in England because he believes that there is a safer road to the realization of Lenin's ultimate ideals than the dictatorship of the proletariat. "A Parliamentary election," he says, "will give us all the power that Lenin had to get by a revolution, and such a majority can proceed to effect the transition from capitalism to socialism with the cooperation of the people, and not merely by edict." A defense of parliamentary government that proceeds from the assumption that it is valuable principally as a means of making England socialist may not appeal strongly to all its present champions. Judging from the complacency with which conservatives generally contemplated Czardom—at any rate they did not urge intervention to suppress it—the inference is perhaps not unfair that they object to the dictatorship of the proletariat not because it is dictatorial but because it is proletarian. Mr. Macdonald's objection is precisely the reverse; to him its proletarianism is the only good thing about it. But socialists, he tells his readers, ought not to accept the doctrine "that capitalist methods of repression and force can be used by socialists to free peoples, and that a rule of tyranny is necessary as a preliminary to a reign of liberty." He puts no more trust in "the tyranny to end all tyranny" than he did in "the war to end all war." Dictatorship, he believes, begets its kind; a Lenin produces a Kolchak.

Parliamentary democracy, in Mr. Macdonald's opinion, has nothing to learn from the soviet system, which he defines as "a pyramid of local governing authorities topped by what is, to all intents and purposes, a national executive." The Russian soviets are both organs of local government and electoral colleges for the choice of members of the soviet next higher in the political hierarchy; by the time the supreme or national soviet is reached, all contact with the mass of the people has been lost. It is in essence an aristocratic system, which involves an abandonment of the democratic creed. "Only a low state of political interest and intelligence will tolerate this system of government." Nor does Mr. Macdonald look with favor upon the proposal to substitute industrial occupation for geographical area

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and citizenship as the basis of parliamentary constituencies. A parliament made up of representatives of trade constituencies would be a narrow-minded and inefficient Parliament. "Labor in politics is different from labor in the workshop, because the nation is not an accumulation of a set of separate workshops or trades, but these organized into an economic and social unity." The faults in the present parliamentary system are serious, but they are not caused by the nature of the constituencies. There should, however, be closer contact than at present between the industrial and the political life of the country, and Mr. Macdonald sees in the reform of the House of Lords the opportunity to bring this about. Organize the Second Chamber on a soviet franchise! To revolutionists a Second Chamber of any kind may seem a superfluity; to conservatives the proposal will seem more striking than statesmanlike.

As a piece of argumentation "Parliament and Revolution" leaves a good deal to be desired. Its logical texture is not of the finest; too often it gives us assertion where we want demonstration; and as for "scientific" and "unbiased," these adjectives, by which the book is described in the publishers' advertisement on the paper cover, have no more to do with the case than the flowers that bloom in the spring. The moral which the book is really intended to teach is that only the Independent Labor Party—Mr. Macdonald's party—can save England. With the disintegration of the Liberal Party the political prospects of Labor in England are bright. But the heresy of Revolution must be put down.

ROBERT LIVINGSTON SCHUYLER

Superstition and Surgery

The Superstition of Divorce. By G. K. Chesterton. John Lane Company.

EVEN the Home for Ancient and Indignant Punsters has a sensation in store for it when the time comes for Gilbert Keith Chesterton to retire. Other men's wits are like rifles or revolvers; his is a machine-gun. To change the metaphor, he is the Leo Ornstein of style: he can take a simple theme and dress it up with arpeggios and with counterpoint that hold the listener breathless, while he plays it on his typewriter with such sincerity that, one feels, blood must be wiped from the keys after each performance.

And the wonder of it is that the theme is always so simple. Now he has written an encomium of marriage, proving that there is an attraction between the sexes, that this results in the establishment of a home and in the perpetuation of the race, and that, though the home is usually happy, it is sometimes not so. Based on these incontrovertible truths an argument is built up that divorce is abnormal and should therefore *never* be allowed. If one is married to a homicidal maniac one may have a release—but one must not spell it with a hyphen. But short of homicidal mania, not even separation should be allowed. He takes two of the common causes given for divorce, drunkenness and cruelty. For the first, he shows that as the misfortune of a woman in marrying a drunkard is no greater than the misfortune of a man in marrying a teetotaler, each should endure the other's foible in a Christian spirit of resignation. The charge of cruelty he thinks is generally snobbish, the application of a gentleman's standard to a working man's circumstances. Where a gentleman slams the door on his wife, and goes into the smoking-room, a navvy slams his wife on the door, and stays in the smoking-room, which in this case is also kitchen, parlor, and bedroom. Probably even Mr. Chesterton would admit that there was a certain desirable temperance in wife-beating: the old English law, I believe, was that a husband should be indulged in that luxury only when he used a stick no thicker than his thumb.

The present prevalence of divorce is due, we are told, to a nefarious conspiracy of the rich against the poor: it is an effort to break up the family on the maxim, divide and conquer. What the magnates fear above all things is home-rule. What they want is to make the parents loose in order that they may draft the children into the industrial army; to turn the infants into infantry by turning the adults to adultery. The same people who recommend the poor men to eat grass recommend the poor women to become grass widows. Divorce is nothing but a whitewash for black sheep, a method of making profligacy respectable by turning the proverbial wild oats into a sort of harmless Quaker oats.

Mr. Chesterton seems to imagine that divorce is now being advocated for its own sake. There may be a few fanatics who are as mad about breaking up marriages as Dr. Cutler Walpole was about the operation for the luciform sack, and who remark: "However many divorces there are, there are not half enough." But most people regard divorce, like surgery, as a necessary evil. Few men resort to the hospital or to the court for the pure pleasure of the thing. A cure at Reno is not yet as fashionable as a cure at Baden-Baden or Aix. Perhaps there is too much laxity nowadays in regarding marriage as a temporary contract. The rights of both parties and of the children must be considered. But to forbid divorce and remarriage altogether, as a desperate remedy for extreme cases, is no more rational or humane than it would be to forbid surgery to all because most do not stand in present need of it.

PRESERVED SMITH

Villagers and Others

No. 26 Jayne Street. By Mary Austin. Houghton Mifflin Company.

The Stranger. By Arthur Bullard. The Macmillan Company.

Half-Portions. By Edna Ferber. Doubleday, Page and Company.

THE first imaginative light on the confusions of our war period comes to us in Mrs. Austin's new novel. She saw that period, to be sure, from Greenwich Village, but not without a thorough awareness of what the country at large was feeling and doing. With a rather schematic care she has introduced every shade of opinion and feeling except the darkest. But she has been the first to do justice in fiction to the sense of alarm and estrangement with which the authentic American, whatever his descent, saw his country abandon the liberties which had been the source and essence of his pride. Within this world of rapid change and resistance and aspiration she isolates a peculiar problem and seeks to transfer the ideals of complete democracy into the shadowiest recesses of the personal life. Her attempt is original and subtle and its subtlety of presentation is heightened by the fact that, before writing this story, Mrs. Austin seems to have steeped herself in Henry James. The problem, as she finally does present it, is indeed full of matter. For years Rose Matlock and Adam Frear, both libertarian idealists, have been lovers. Frear withdraws from the relationship and becomes engaged to Neith Schuyler. Rose appeals to Neith, not on the ordinary and vulgar grounds, but because Frear's defection was based on his feelings alone and thus illustrated a reversion in his private life to the very principles of tyranny which he was publicly pledged to destroy. Neith takes Rose's point and suspends her engagement until Adam Frear shall have, at least spiritually, awakened to the autocratic quality of his own action. The point is an extremely nice one; to disengage it at all is not easy. To many, furthermore, who hope they do not yield to Mrs. Austin in their hope for freedom and justice among men, her argument will seem untenable because it transfers a principle of conduct to a category where that principle ceases to have any meaning. Mrs. Austin is a thousand times right when she bases all hope for the future on man's ability "to act on the intrinsic merits of a situation, independently of its emotions." But in the situation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that had existed between Rose and Frear the emotions were themselves the intrinsic and the only merits. When Frear's feelings altered, the original situation no longer existed except in the sense that the green leaf still exists in the brown. A change had occurred that is biological in its nature and involved the automatic disappearance of the preceding stage. It was deplorable that Frear adopted conventional gestures stained by much vulgar use. The perceptions into which his two admirable friends seek to torment him simply did not fit the case. These very remarks, however, should reveal the order of interest in Mrs. Austin's story, her high accomplishment and vigorous intelligence.

Mr. Bullard, like Mrs. Austin, envisages the world from Greenwich Village. His book, unlike hers, is strikingly unliterary—unliterary not like a folk-song, but like a newspaper. Yet through this unlettered manner there comes to us the breath of a scrupulous and free and poetic mind. How characteristic that is of us! Mr. Bullard has really thought and felt deeply and beautifully and is capable of asking us to believe that a novelist whom he represents as a careful artist wrote of a "passion to make this world of ours a cleaner, more wholesome, and happier place." It is clear that Winslow Mathews composed on a typewriter. At least he did not write "this old world of ours." To him and to this whole group of artists and social workers who strive to turn a juster vision upon art and life, there comes a contrast and a revelation from the Orient in the person of Donald Lane, the Stranger, a mighty linguist, a Moslem by faith and a Moroccan by adoption. Mr. Bullard's attempt to break down the coarse prejudice and shallow superiority of the Westerner's attitude toward the religion and culture of the East is wholly admirable. He succeeds in warming the mind toward the spiritual grace and gravity, the dignity and frankness of the Moslem world. One ceases to follow him when he offers its mysticism and fatalism as a panacea for our ills. The trouble with the Western world is not that it has thought too much, but that it has thought too little; not that it has lacked faith, but that it has fixed too easy a faith upon delusions and myths. As a character and a sympathetic intermediary between East and West, Mr. Bullard's Stranger is picturesque and charming; as a guide and philosopher he is amiably sentimental and futile.

Miss Edna Ferber is not, like either Mrs. Austin or Mr. Bullard, thoughtful about the affairs of the world. She simply does not let herself think. When her stories touch on the war she has just the patches of cheerful sweetness varied by patches of equally cheerful hate that her large public considers decent under the circumstances. It is a very great pity. In the essential energy of artistic creation, in the faculty, let us say, of Fielding, she is far stronger than many of her more intellectual colleagues. Her best characters, dashed off in a few sharp, swift, but well-considered lines, have vigor and raciness and the very throb of life. The three sisters in "The Maternal Feminine," the old ladies, the son and the wife in "Old Lady Mandle"—how extraordinarily good they are! But no sooner does Miss Ferber set these and others on their feet than the story snaps off and melts into the sweetish heart-interest or uplift mush which the great middle-class magazines demand and pay for. If some one would endow Miss Ferber, and make it no longer too expensive for her to think or bring a story to an honest conclusion, she might become a sort of American Arnold Bennett.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

Books in Brief

THE currents of Dutch political sympathies during the war are described and measured in Dr. F. J. Krop's "Hugenootsche en Calvinistische Stemmen" (Rotterdam: Ph. Zalsman). The battle cry of "Neutral Holland" did not connote unanimity of view or opinion, and the ebb and flow of sentiment during the war are here noted in minute detail by a careful observer. At the opening of the war, three classes of the Dutch people naturally sympathized with the Central Powers—the profiteers in war material, the subscribers to German war loans, and those who had various affiliations which were put in jeopardy by hostilities. Of the Roman Catholics, a majority saw in the possible victory of the Allies a triumph of free religion and of the "infidel" French. Since Austria was so prominent, her cause seemed a Catholic one. It was Roman Catholic Mittel Europa, also, that had control of Jerusalem and the Holy Land. At least one-third of the population of the Netherlands are Roman Catholic, and of these three-fourths were pro-German. The Jews, as a rule, were in sympathy with the Allies. The Socialists were not interested in the religious phase of the question. It is when he deals with the ex-premier, Dr. Abraham Kuyper, who is perhaps the chief Dutch "politicus," journalist, and man of letters, that Krop is most effective. Down to 1914, this ultra-Calvinistic Dutch lecturer on Calvinism and professed champion of the people was in favor of France as against Germany; for, believing in the sovereignty of the people, Dr. Kuyper considered Germany an awful example of formalism and autocracy, while France—though not beyond criticism in method—was admired, because the French people ruled. Suddenly, in 1914, the ex-premier changed front. So pronounced, indeed, was this *volte-face* that Kaiser Wilhelm sent him birthday greetings, in an autograph note. Apparently the rank and file in the ultra-Calvinistic churches followed Kuyper. His reasoning was that, in Germany, the sovereignty of the people had resolved itself into an ideal state, of which a very pious ruler was head, who gave glory to God. The pro-German partisans in Holland marshaled their objections to Great Britain's exercise of the right of search, her severity, her Boer War, her purpose to possess most of the world, her hostility to Germany's ambitions, and her general rapacity. Moreover, they wanted no pan-English domination. Krop handles these questions ably, but his heaviest blows are theological. He contrasts Kuyper's Calvinism with that of Groen van Prinsterer (Motley's ablest critic). While having little or no sympathy with the "modernen," Krop claims that the logic of Calvinism is ever for freedom.

IN a simple, stately essay on "Seneca" (Longmans, Green) Mr. Francis Holland does something to undo the serious reproach brought against modern classical scholars that they so rarely undertake interesting biographies of ancient heroes. The grave dignity of Mr. Holland's style has somehow the fine sound of the best translations from the Latin; the spirit of his enterprise is ripely philosophical. Seneca, as here conceived, is not the writer of the turbulent tragedies, which, indeed, Mr. Holland thinks Seneca never wrote; nor is he that corrupter of taste which various later Roman critics believed him to have been. Instead he is set forth as an eminent man of action, teacher of Nero, and for five years, with Burrhus, almost the administrator of the Empire, who recorded as philosophy what he had lived as wisdom and prudence. Mr. Holland does not minimize the lack of loftiness which appears during Seneca's banishment to Corsica under Claudius nor does he interpret too agreeably those Neronian addresses which came from the compliant pen of Seneca—one of them unpardonably justifying Nero's murder of his mother. But he does argue that Seneca, as a man of the world, writing for the men of a world in which tyranny held its capricious sword constantly over the most virtuous heads, may be excused for being less metaphysical than the Greeks and in his stoicism shrewd and adaptable. Seneca has had many reputations: as a Christian, as a casuist, as a literary iconoclast, as a stoic in purple and very fine linen, as a man of blood-and-thunder; Mr. Holland makes him out a sort of Roman cousin to the Gallic sage Montaigne.

IN "Shakespeare and the Welsh" (London: Unwin), an agreeable product of racial pride, Mr. Frederick Harries reminds one pleasantly of the prominent roles played by Welshmen in Elizabethan England and of Shakespeare's treatment of Celtic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

character and theme. But Mr. Harries rides his hobby over some unsubstantial ground. Both author and publisher make a considerable point of the genealogy, first published, by the way, some twenty-five years ago, which seeks to prove the presence of a Celtic strain in Shakespeare's blood; and Mr. Harries ignores the difficulty of really establishing the identity of Richard Shakespeare of Wroxall with the poet's grandfather Richard Shakespeare of Snitterfield. To rear upon this foundation a picture of the youthful Shakespeare imbibing Welsh lore at his grandmother's knee is to come dangerously near romance. Anxious as he is to prove Shakespeare's predilection for the Welsh, even Mr. Harries admits that his praise of Elizabeth may not have been due chiefly to her Celtic descent. To say the best, one may spend a pleasant hour with the book, though the suppression of some commonplace facts about Shakespeare and some not very original analyses of characters in the plays would have reduced it to the more suitable form of an essay.

"THE PHYSICAL BASIS OF HEREDITY," by T. Hunt Morgan (Lippincott), is a college text-book which presents the fundamental aspects of heredity as they are conceived by the recent experimenters along the lines initiated by Gregor Mendel. The two principles discovered by Mendel were segregation and independent assortment; since 1900 four other principles or "laws" have been added, known as linkage, the linear order of the genes, interference, and the limitation of the linkage groups. While the first five can be stated independently of the chromosal mechanism, yet they are all considered the necessary outcome of that mechanism, and the author bases his twenty chapters on a discussion of this theory, which is correlated with a particulate theory of heredity. The treatment is involved, taking for granted a basic knowledge of genetics, and wholly lacks a summary or any general statements which would make it understandable by the intelligent layman.

Music

The New York and Bach Festivals

OF the hundred or more music festivals that have taken place during the last three months, two stand out with peculiar significance and in direct antithesis: the New York festival and the Bach festival at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. The former, undertaken by Walter Damrosch and his forces, the New York Symphony Orchestra and the New York Oratorio Society, assisted by branch choral societies from Brooklyn and New Jersey, consumed four evenings and two afternoons of the week of April 5. The festival chorus numbered 1,500, the orchestra numbered 150, and the 71st Regiment Armory seated some five thousand people. No expense had been spared for soloists, who were, for the "Elijah" performance, Frieda Hempel, Rachel Morton Harris, Merle Alcock, Edward Johnson, and Louis Graveure; for "The Pilgrim's Progress," Julia Claussen, Vera Curtis, Reinald Werrenrath, Lambert Murphy, Frederick Patton, Charles T. Tittmann, and Royal Dadmun; and for "The Damnation of Faust," Florence Easton, Orville Harold, Leon Rothier, and Frederick Patton. There was also an evening for Rachmaninoff, who acted in the triple capacity of composer, soloist, and accompanist for Sophie Braslau, who sang a group of his songs; there was a Bach-Beethoven-Brahms matinee, for which the Bach Choir and Dr. Wolle were brought from Bethlehem, and Jascha Heifetz and Pablo Casals were engaged to play the double Brahms concerto; while the final concert had, as its central attraction, Mme. Schumann-Heink, who, at the last moment, took the place of Tetrazzini.

While it would be churlish to cavil at such an array of talent, one could but regret the sensational aspect it lent to the occasion. Curiously enough, this missed fire where least expected,

ALFRED · A · KNOPF BORZOI BOOKS 220 W. 42 Street, NEW YORK

Pio Baroja

is the name of the foremost contemporary Spanish novelist, in the view of such critics as Harold J. Laski of Harvard, John Garret Underhill, H. L. Mencken, etc. "He stands," says Mr. Mencken in his Introduction to Baroja's newest book, YOUTH AND EGOLATRY, "for the modern Spanish mind at its most enlightened. He is the Spaniard of education and worldly wisdom . . . the Spaniard who, in the long run, must erect a new structure of society upon the half archaic and half utopian chaos now reigning in the peninsular." YOUTH AND EGOLATRY is not a novel, but a shrewd and informative autobiographical doctrinaire. ($1.75)

The Golden Bird

is the first book (although anything but the first written work) of a very young English writer, Dorothy Easton. It is a collection of sketches and stories of the southern countryside of England. Miss Easton was "discovered" by John Galsworthy, who is very enthusiastic about her and has written an Introduction to her book. ($2.00)

The One Hundred Per Cent American's Credo

"That celery is good for the nerves;
"That a man with two shots of cocaine in him could lick Jack Dempsey;
"That cripples always have very sunny dispositions;
"That the Masonic order goes back to the days of King Solomon;
"That when a drunken man falls he never hurts himself;
"If a bat flies into a woman's hair, the hair must be cut off to get it out;
"That all the women in Chicago have large feet;
"That all moving-picture magnates were formerly in the cloak and suit business and are enormously wealthy."

Presented (with a 103-page preface, plumbing the national psychology) by George Jean Nathan and H. L. Mencken, in THE AMERICAN CREDO. ($1.75)

Economic Reprints

I. THE LIFE OF ROBERT OWEN, by Himself. With an introduction by M. Beer, author of "A History of British Socialism." ($1.50)

II-III. THE LIFE AND STRUGGLES OF WILLIAM LOVETT. The autobiography of a remarkable man—one of the first labor leaders of England, organizer of the Chartist movement and author of the "people's charter." (Two volumes, $3.00 the set)

IV. THE PIONEERS OF LAND REFORM. Essays by Thomas Paine ("Agrarian Justice"); William Ogilvie ("The Right of Property in Land"); and Thomas Spence ("Nationalization of the Land"). ($1.50)

Mr. A. P. Herbert

will be remembered for his unforgetable novel "The Secret Battle," wherein two British campaigns during the war were pictured in their awful reality. His new book of poems (THE BOMBER GYPSY) carries a note of the same cry, but conveyed this time through the medium of bitingly sardonic verse. Most of the poems, however, are meant simply to amuse. ($1.50)

Speaking of the Anti-Rent Movement

as so many of us do nowadays, how many people recall the time when there was actually war (with blood, and bullets, and lynchings) between tenants and landlords in New York? The Anti-Rent War of the 1840's is the background of a new novel, BARENT CREIGHTON, by Don Cameron Shafer. An exciting story, with a large dash of humor, mystery, and a romance, and guaranteed not to exert the brain too greatly. ($2.00)

W. H. Hudson's "Birds and Man"

has been reprinted and just issued in a new edition. This famous work by the author of "Green Mansions" is the description of his experiences in stalking his two favorite quarries (the feathered and the human animal) in two continents. (Frontispiece in color; $3.50)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as in the Brahms Concerto, where much of the finesse and no little of the tone of Messrs. Heifetz and Casals became utterly lost in the orchestra; while in the Rachmaninoff concerto for the piano, that instrument sounded much as it does in a phonograph. The choral works, too, suffered cruelly from the uneven acoustic properties of the hall and the undue augmentation of the chorus. This lack of balance was particularly noticeable in the "Elijah," which opened the festival, and which Mendelssohn wrote for two hundred, not a thousand, voices; there was a well merited if unconscious rebuke in the effect produced by Dr. Wolle's choir, the quality of whose singing created no need for quantity.

The most important feature of the festival was the first New York performance of Edgar Stillman Kelley's oratorio based on Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress." The work is divided into three parts, of which the second, perhaps, with its fascinating "Chorus of Vendors and People," is the most original; for while its gaiety at times borders perilously on comic opera, it has much of that delicate fancy and humor that we associate with Mr. Kelley's music. On the whole, it proved to be a work of much beauty, finely constructed and well scored. Its chief fault was that it contained too much of Richard Wagner and too little of the composer.

The Russian evening seemed to corroborate Ernest Newman's assertion that "Rachmaninoff's music has never been known to smile." There was the sadly beautiful symphonic poem, "The Isle of the Dead," the lovely chorus (*a capella*) "Laud ye the name of the Lord," written in the minor mode of the Greek church, a less inspired cantata, "Springtime," a plaintive air for first violins and orchestra, and the overlong and somewhat dreary second piano concerto. There was also a group of songs, accompanied with exquisite sympathy by the composer and sung with rare beauty by Miss Braslau, whose rich, warm voice invested them with remarkable vitality and sincerity. For the most part it was suave and mournful music, singularly free from the heartbreak of misery and the stain of earth. As an expression of Russian ideals, its pages seem already to have collected much dust.

The real star of the festival was the one least heralded: Berlioz's "Damnation of Faust." Not even the tired beat of a tired conductor could drag down its primitive freshness to the level of perfunctoriness. If one could feel grateful to Mr. Damrosch, it would be for the opportunity to hear this masterpiece again. Yet it would have been heard to far greater advantage at one of the ordinary concerts of the Oratorio Society, as, for that matter, would any of the other choral works given. After all, why the festival? It is true that it drew a daily attendance of several thousand people. But so will any concert where there is a galaxy of stars. One had the feeling all week that it was a festival of soloists rather than of music. In New York that is bringing coals to Newcastle.

If the Bach festival at Bethlehem did nothing more than bring back the spirit of reverence and humility to the sensation-loving audiences of today, it would still more than justify its existence. The mood of the listener is undoubtedly prepared by the charm of the quaint old Moravian town, the peace and quiet of the church setting, and the "chorals" played by the historic trombone-choir in the belfry. Yet it is the great Johann Sebastian himself who performs the final miracle. Before his mighty music no critic can be critical, no musician worthy of the name can feel less than exalted and abashed. He is the one musical god whom all can unite in worshiping.

For the first session of the fifteenth Bach festival on May 28 and 29, Dr. Wolle selected the B-minor Suite and the two cantatas, "There is Nought of Soundness" and "How Brightly Shines Yon Star of Morn"; for the second he selected the motet "Sing Ye to the Lord a New-made Song," the second Brandenburg Concerto, and the cantata "Sleepers, Wake." These comprised the offerings of the first day, offerings of unforgettable beauty. The soloists were Mildred Faas, Charles T. Tittmann, and Nicholous Douty, the last named bravely substituting for Reed Miller on short notice. The orchestra consisted of members of the Philadelphia Symphony. The second day was devoted to the B-minor Mass, which was the outstanding feature of the festival, and for which the soloists were Florence Hinkle, Merle Alcock, Nicholous Douty, and Robert Maitland. It is impossible to describe the majesty and tenderness of Bach, the massive structures of sound in the double choruses, the marvelous running counter-point, the poignant appeal of the solos. One can merely define the work of the executants. And when one finds that many of the choir are untrained singers who not only are able to sing this difficult and intricate music with freedom and precision and understanding and tonal color, but are able also to sing the great mass from cover to cover without a director and even without a book, one can only then begin to appreciate the remarkable ability of Dr. Wolle, their only leader.

It is not very important whether one agrees or does not agree with Dr. Wolle's interpretations of Bach. He asks for no applause at his festivals. What is important is that he has been able to take material in the raw and train it to sing Bach. There are, apparently, a few other men in the country who like Dr. Wolle have been working quietly and greatly in his way, and of whom we become aware only when we chance to hear the results of their labors. That these results can be startling we learned recently from the concert of the St. Olaf Lutheran Choir, from Northfield, Minnesota, trained and led by S. Melius Christiansen. Equally amazing reports are coming from Northampton, Massachusetts, of the work being done there with the Choral Club by Ivan Gorokhoff, for many years director of the famous Russian Cathedral Choir of New York. Such men as these are doing more with their amateur societies for the development of choral art than are all the oratorio societies in the country.

HENRIETTA STRAUS

RUSSIAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS

March, 1917—March, 1920—Documents and Papers

Compiled and edited by C. K. Cumming and Walter W. Pettit, under the direction of John A. Ryan, D.D., J. Henry Scattergood, and William Allen White, at the request of *The League of Free Nations Association.*

The documents and papers contained in this volume constitute almost complete materials for the history of the relations between the United States and Russia during these years, and throw a new light on the relations between Russia and the Allies. $3.50 *net.*

"An extremely valuable contribution to an honest understanding of the Russian problem. Its chief value lies in its orderly, chronological presentation of the facts without any taint of propaganda or partisan bias."
—*New York Tribune.*

HARCOURT, BRACE & HOWE, 1 W. 47th ST. NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Contents

WHITEWASHING BRITISH RULE IN INDIA. By Helena Normanton 831
THE HUNTER COMMITTEE'S REPORT..... 833
THE FINDINGS OF THE INDIA NATIONAL CONGRESS COMMITTEE 835
"SATYAGRAHA" 837

Whitewashing British Rule in India

By HELENA NORMANTON

For long months Great Britain has anxiously awaited the publication of the report of the Committee presided over by the Scottish judge, Lord Hunter, sent out to India to investigate the Punjab disturbances of April, 1919, their causes, and the measures taken to deal with them. The news of the Amritsar massacre, released eight months after the event itself, intensely shocked democratic Britain and blackened her name in the eyes of the world. It is regrettable, but undeniable, that that stain will not be obliterated by the Report. It is so much whitewash.

The Report is not unanimous in its findings. There were five European and three Indian members on the committee and it is unfortunate that the two reports, majority and minority, separate upon racial lines. The three Indian members sign a Minority Report which is much more severe in its judgments than the Majority, but as the latter is the one which will stand, at any rate technically, its findings are briefly discussed below.

No one could congratulate the writers of the Report upon logical sequence or coherence. Events, causes, and conclusions are confusingly intertwined. The first things every impartial outsider will want to know are: whether there was any real organized anti-British conspiracy in the Punjab; and if there was any connection of a treasonable nature between the Punjab outbreaks of April and the Afghan war of May. If either or both existed, stern measures would be at any rate comprehensible whether completely justifiable or not. If the findings be in the negative then the case for Dyerism breaks down in advance.

What then are the findings on this point? The Majority Report says: "On the evidence before us there is nothing to show that the outbreak in the Punjab was part of a prearranged conspiracy to overthrow the British Government in India by force. On the other hand the Punjab Government had been advised by their legal advisers that the Satyagraha movement amounted to an illegal conspiracy against the government. We believe that Mr. Gandhi is honestly opposed to the employment of force or violence in the prosecution of his aim. But the general teaching of the doctrine of civil disobedience to laws to masses of uneducated men must inevitably tend to breach of the peace and disorder . . . and would mean the paralysis of government. . . . Apart from the existence of any deeply laid scheme to overthrow the British, a movement which had started in rioting and become a rebellion might be developed rapidly into a revolution."

In other words, a revolution was a mere possibility; and much the same might be said of every land on the globe today. The one person apparently who did use the word "revolution" was Mrs. Besant in a letter to the *Times of India* of April 18, 1919, when, writing hundreds of miles away from the scene of the outbreaks, she somewhat hastily assumed that the acts of violence which had indisputably taken place were "not the actions of Satyagrahis, nor even of casual rioters, but of revolutionaries." The Majority Report uses this letter in a somewhat diffident way against the Punjabis, but having already said that the outbreak was "not part of a prearranged conspiracy" it does not lean upon it too confidently.

As to any connection with Afghanistan, the Report makes the following statement:

> On 8th May war with Afghanistan was declared. The Punjab government were in possession of information which at the time seemed to point to a connection between the outbreak of hostilities in Afghanistan and the risings in the Punjab. In explaining this Mr. Thompson said: "Of course the matter has not been cleared up yet, but the position we take up is that we put you in possession of the evidence we have, but we do not claim that it proves anything more than that the Amir took advantage of the troubles in India and that he had certain emissaries in India."

Obviously then in point of view of foreign aid and treasonable intent, the outbreak was a hundred times less serious than the Irish Rebellion of 1916. Yet the punishment was a thousand times more severe.

Interest will center first upon Dyer's massacre owing to its sensationally dramatic character. That a British general could pitilessly exhaust his ammunition upon thousands of unarmed and unwarned Indians squatting upon the ground at an open air meeting, leave the dead unburied and the dying untended, and forbid for a number of hours even their removal by means of a Curfew Order is something new to civilization. This Dyer owned in his own evidence. Now for the Report. "We think it distinctly improbable—notwithstanding what General Dyer said in his evidence—that the crowd gathered in the Jallianwala Bagh would have dispersed upon notice being made that they should do so and much more likely that recourse to firing would have been necessary to secure obedience to his proclamation (i.e., forbidding public meetings) . . . notice to disperse would have afforded those assembled in ignorance of the proclamation and other people also an opportunity to leave the Bagh and should have been given. If the notice had been disregarded General Dyer would have been justified in firing on the crowd to compel it to disperse. In continuing to fire for so long as he did it appears to us that General Dyer committed a grave error. . . . We believe that he honestly considered that he was called upon in the discharge of his duty to take the extreme step which he did. . . . In continuing to fire as long as he did it is evident that General Dyer had in view not merely the dispersal of the crowd that had assembled contrary to his orders, but the desire to produce a moral effect in the Punjab. . . . In our view this was unfortunately a mistaken conception of his duty. If necessary a crowd that has assembled contrary to a proclamation issued to prevent or terminate disorder may have to be fired upon; but continued firing upon that crowd cannot be justified because of the effect such firing may have upon people in other places. . . . It has not been proved to us that any wounded people were in fact exposed to unnecessary suffering from want of medical treatment. . . . The action taken by General Dyer has also been described by others as having averted a rebellion on a scale similar to the Mutiny. It does not, however, appear to us possible to draw this conclusion particularly in view of the fact that it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not proved that a conspiracy to overthrow British power had been formed prior to the outbreaks."

Thus has been whitewashed the most hideous governmental crime of modern times. The Indian National Congress has collected its own evidence by means of a committee strengthened by the inclusion of India's national saint, Mr. Gandhi. From its volume of evidence the following description of the massacre is taken, and may be compared with the Hunter Committee's findings:

[Statement of Mian Sikander Ali, son of a mill proprietor.]

. . . On the 13th April, about 12 o'clock, when I was at the house of a friend of mine (Mr. Hakim Singh) near the Golden Temple, Lala Daya Ram Suri came there and informed us that there was a proclamation near the Kotwali that no one should attend any meeting and that the city was under martial law from that date. Mr. Daya Ram said that the people ran away when they saw the troops and that very few persons heard what the proclamation was. I can say positively that no such proclamation was made in my side of the city nor any printed notices distributed or posted anywhere in the town. I did not pay attention to what Mr. Daya Ram said then. Later, I thought over it and was puzzled greatly, as the Government had not notified the introduction of martial law at all. . . . On reaching there (i. e., the Bagh) at about 5 p. m., I found Lala Dholan Das's eldest son, Mr. Sita Ram, his nephew, Mr. Gobind Ram, and two or three other persons. They were all looking towards the meeting from the top roof of the house. I took binoculars from Mr. Sita Ram to see who was speaking. I saw Pandit Durga Das, and was just mentioning this fact to Mr. Sita Ram, when I saw Gurkhas, with rifles in their hands rushing into the garden from the Queen's Statue side, and form into two lines to the left, as they entered on the Hansli—a raised ground in the Jallianwala Bagh covering the canal that feeds the Golden Temple tanks. They were forty to fifty in all as far as I could judge from a distance. Immediately an order was given to fire. No warning was given to the people to disperse. There were five or six European military and civil officers, including Messrs. Rehill and Plomer, one Inspector of Police, Mian Mohd Ashraf, two Baluchee Officers, Mit Singh, Sub-Inspector, two or three policemen in uniform, and some others, including Bhagwan Singh and Wedhawa Singh in plain clothes. I think Inspector Jawahar Lal, of the C. I. D., was also present. The firing continued incessantly for about ten to fifteen minutes at least, without any perceptible break. I saw hundreds of persons killed on the spot. In the Bagh there were about twelve to fifteen thousand persons and they consisted of many villagers who had come to Amritsar to see the Baisakhi fair. Quick firing guns were used. The worst part of the whole thing was that the firing was directed towards the gates through which the people were running out. There were small outlets, four or five in all, and bullets actually rained over the people at all these gates. Shots were also fired into the thick of the meeting. There was not a corner left of the garden facing the firing line, where people did not die in large numbers. Many got trampled under the feet of the rushing crowds and thus lost their lives. Blood was pouring in profusion. Even those who lay flat on the ground were shot, as I saw the Gurkhas kneel down and fire. As soon as the firing stopped, the troops and officers all cleared away. No arrangements were made by the authorities to look after the dead or wounded. I was told later that Mr. Rehill and Mr. Jawahar Lal could not bear to see the firing through and went outside the garden to avoid the sight.

Hundreds of persons had got into Lala Dholan Das's house, and amongst those were six or eight badly wounded persons. It was with some difficulty that I succeeded in clearing out the crowd from the house. I then gave water to the wounded and rendered such assistance as was possible under the circumstances. While I was so engaged, the eldest son of my friend Mr. Hakim Singh came running to me and said that his father had not returned to the house till then. I got extremely anxious and asked the boy to remain in the house to quiet his mother and others, and I went to look for my friend in the Jallianwala Bagh. I went round the whole place and saw almost everybody lying there.

There were heaps of them at different places, and people were turning over dead bodies to recognize their relations or friends. The dead bodies were of grown up people and young boys also. At or near the gates the number was very large, and bodies were scattered in large numbers all over the garden. Some had their heads cut open, others had eyes shot, and nose, chest, arms, or legs shattered. It was a fearful and ghastly sight. I noticed one or two buffaloes also killed on the ground. I think there must have been over one thousand dead bodies in the garden then. Having satisfied myself that my friend was not amongst the lot there, I returned to his house to see if he had come home in the meanwhile. On reaching [the house] I found Mr. Hakim Singh at home, but his younger son and a friend of the boys were not to be found. Again I ran to the garden to look for these two boys and went round the garden for the second time. By that time over three or four hundred dead bodies must have been removed. I roughly calculated five to six hundred still lying there. I did not find the boys and when I was still looking for them, I was informed that they had got back to the house.

I saw people were hurrying up, and many had to leave their dead and wounded, because they were afraid of being fired upon again after 8 p. m. Many amongst the wounded who managed to run away from the garden succumbed on their way to the injuries received and lay dead in the streets. I reached my mills just close upon 8 p. m. It was thus that the people of Amritsar held their Baisakhi fair. . . .

[Statement of Ratan Devi, residing near Jallianwala Bagh.]

I was in my house near Jallianwala Bagh when I heard shots fired. I was then lying down. I got up at once as I was anxious, because my husband had gone to the Bagh. I began to cry, and went to the place accompanied by two women to help me. There I saw heaps of dead bodies and I began to search for my husband. After passing through that heap, I found the dead body of my husband. The way towards it was full of blood and of dead bodies. After a short time, both the sons of Lala Sundar Das came there, and I asked them to bring a *charpai* (cot) to carry the dead body of my husband home. The boys accordingly went home and I sent away the two women also. By this time it was 8 o'clock and no one could stir out of his house because of the curfew order. I stood on waiting and crying. At about eight-thirty a Sikh gentleman came. There were others who were looking for something amongst the dead. I did not know them. I entreated the Sikh gentleman to help me in removing my husband's body to a dry place, for that place was overflowing with blood. He caught the body by the head and I by the legs, and we carried it to a dry place and laid it down on a wooden block. I waited up to 10 p. m., but no one arrived there. I got up and started towards Ablowa Katra. I thought of asking some student from the Thakurdwara to help me in carrying my husband home. I had not gone far, when some man sitting in a window in an adjacent house asked me where I was going at that late hour. I said I wanted some men to carry my husband's dead body home. He said he was attending a wounded man and as it was past 8 p. m. nobody could help me then. Then I started towards Katra and another man asked me the same question. I made the same appeal to him and he gave me the same answer. I had gone hardly three or four steps when I saw an old man smoking and some people sleeping by his side. I repeated the whole of my sad story to him with hands folded. He took great pity upon me and asked those men to go with me. They said that it was 10 o'clock, and that they would not like to be shot down. That was no time to stir out; how could they go out so far? So I went back and seated myself by the side of my dead husband. Accidentally, I found a bamboo stick which I kept in my hand to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

keep off dogs. I saw three men writhing in agony, a buffalo struggling in great pain; and a boy about twelve years old in agony entreated me not to leave the place. I told him that I could not go anywhere leaving the dead body of my husband. I asked him if he wanted any wrap, and if he was feeling cold I could spread it over him. He asked for water, but water could not be procured at that place.

I heard the clock striking at regular intervals of one hour. At 2 o'clock, a Jat belonging to Sultan village, who was lying entangled in a wall, asked me to go near him and to raise his leg. I got up and taking hold of his clothes drenched in blood raised his leg up. After that, no one else came till half past five. At about six, L. Sundar Das, his sons, and some people from my street came there with a *charpai* and I brought my husband home. I saw other people at the Bagh in search of their relatives. I passed my whole night there. It is impossible for me to describe what I felt. Heaps of dead bodies lay there, some on their backs and some with their faces upturned. A number of them were poor innocent children. I shall never forget the sight. I was all alone the whole night in that solitary jungle. Nothing but the barking of dogs or the braying of donkeys was audible. Amidst hundreds of corpses I passed my night, crying and watching. I cannot say more. What I experienced that night is known to me and to God.

The sensational nature of the massacre should not blind one to the horrors of the six weeks of rigorous martial law. The finding of the Committee is that martial law was justifiable: "In our opinion the situation which had arisen in the Punjab was one of extreme gravity and the authorities were justified in declaring martial law. . . . The wisdom of continuing martial law for the length of time it remained operative in the Punjab is more open to criticism than the original declaration. . . . According to Sir Havelock Hudson's views, martial law might have been withdrawn a fortnight earlier but there was an unfortunate delay in the circulation of a file between the Home Department and the Army Department. . . . We find no reason for holding or even thinking that undue harshness was adopted as a matter of deliberate policy."

The following (Statement No. 126) is an absolutely typical Congress Report description of one of the numerous floggings carried on under martial law.

When the boys were flogged in the street in which our house stands, I was in the house opposite the spot. Sometimes I stood up to see the flogging; sometimes I sat down, not being able to bear the sight. The first Sikh boy was whipped with clothes on, then his clothes were taken off, and he was flogged naked. Then all the boys were whipped naked. The third boy became senseless three times. Each time, he was unbound, laid flat in the street, and water was poured down his throat. It was cruel—cruel!

The Hunter Report merely says, "No floggings should take place in public. . . . Some restriction should be imposed on the discretion of area officers in giving sentences of whipping."

As to the celebrated "Crawling Order" of General Dyer, imposed on all who had to pass through the street where an English woman missionary was brutally assaulted by a mob, here is an example of how it worked out:

I have been blind for the last twenty years. I used to have my meals occasionally in Kucha *Kuriehhan*. About April 18, while I was groping my way into the street with the support of a stick that I always carry, I was asked by a policeman to halt. On my begging of him to let me proceed, I was told that I could do so only if I was willing to crawl over the whole length. I informed the policeman that I had been practically starving for the last two days, but he would not let me go. I then had to crawl on my belly, and had hardly gone a few yards when I received a kick on my back, and my stick slipped off my hands. I then moved on, begging for alms from the residents of the quarter, but was advised to leave the place as owing to the bad times through which they were passing, the residents were not in a position to give me food. I then, with great difficulty, managed to make my way out of the lane by the side of Kaurianwa well.

The Crawling Order is one of the few atrocities which the Hunter Report faintly condemns. It remarks that when General Dyer says that it was "only a slight inconvenience" for the residents in the street to fetch their provisions, etc., by going along the tops of the houses, the Committee cannot agree. "The order caused unnecessary inconvenience . . . in subjecting the Indian population to an act of humiliation, it has continued to be a source of bitterness and racial ill-feeling long after it was recalled."

But perhaps brutalities enough have been illustrated and the record is already sufficient. The exceedingly feeble conclusion of the Hunter Report is enough to make the descendants of Hampden, Pym, Howard, and Wilberforce sicken at its name: "Where martial law has been imposed . . . the power of the military commanders need not necessarily be so supreme as was the case in the Punjab." The Report is a disgrace to its signatories and a deeper blot on the name of Britain. The crimes were committed in hot blood. The Report is the product of five men icy in their callousness.

Public opinion in Britain and in India is deeply moved at the rumor that it is the intention of the Secretary of State for India to act first and then report to Parliament. Unless his action be extraordinarily strong, far beyond the terms of this Report, he would act wisely if he resigned and permanently quitted English public life. In any case Parliament ought not to be deprived of its own power to vindicate the shattered honor of Britain.

The Hunter Committee's Report

THE report printed below of the findings of the Hunter Committee appointed to investigate the Punjab disturbances is the official summary made public by the British Government.

Lord Hunter's report is issued in a bulky volume of 200 pages with appendices containing maps and statistics; 100 pages are devoted to a majority report signed by five English members, and 60 pages to a minority report by three Indian members. The report deals fully with each district and contains a chronological statement of events in the Punjab, from March to August, with details of each disturbance, damage to property, railways, etc. Approximate damage in the Punjab is estimated at over £250,000. Both English and Indian members broadly agree in their views of the outstanding causes of the principal events leading to the outbreak. They consider the Satyagraha or civil disobedience movement of Mr. Gandhi responsible for undermining the law-abiding instincts of the population at a time when these instincts were strained to the uttermost by economic distress, war weariness, anxiety as to the political future of India, apprehension as to the Turkish peace terms, and agitation against the policy of the Government in pressing forward and passing the Rowlatt Act. They do not consider that the recruiting methods employed in the Punjab had anything to do with the unrest in that province, but they point out the contrast between the awakening aspirations of India and the restrictions upon liberty inseparable from the war and post-war periods. The Indian members also refer to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the belief that the administration of the Punjab was unsympathetic in its attitude toward these aspirations.

With the exception of the Jallianwala Bagh and certain minor incidents, both Indian and English members generally agree in justifying the firing done by the police and the military. They agree in pronouncing unfavorably upon General Dyer's handling of the Jallianwala Bagh meeting and upon certain of the orders passed in the course of the administration of martial law. They further agree in exonerating the Government of India from all blame.

The Indian and the English members differ in their conclusions as to the precise nature of the disorders, as to the wisdom of introducing and continuing martial law, as to the justification for the policy pursued by the Punjab Government while the troubles were on, and as to the gravity and proper appreciation of certain happenings.

On the broad question of the nature of these disturbances, the English members emphatically state that "open rebellion" is their only suitable description, possessing as they did a public and general object, namely an attempt to paralyze the arm of government by extensive destruction of government buildings and means of communication. "The element of rebellion," the English members say, "as distinct from mere riot on the one hand and from political opposition to government on the other, can be traced throughout; in what sense it may be considered to lack openness, we have failed to discover." They consider that the nature of the movement is not affected by the omission of the mobs to seize firearms, since implements appropriate to the work of destruction were never lacking. They lay stress upon the gravity of the menace to communication as well as upon the seditious language used by mobs and the violent posters exhibited in certain places. The Indian members, however, while admitting that the acts of the mobs may have amounted to waging war in the legal sense, object to the description of the disorders as "open rebellion," on the ground that "open rebellion" implies a rising for the purpose of turning out the British Government, which was not the intention of the rioters. They do not agree with the majority report which considers the Punjab Government justified in believing the riots were in the nature of a rebellion; nor do they share the view of the English members as to the extreme gravity of the attacks upon railways, telegraphs, and bridges, but they point out the omission of the mobs to look for swords and guns, further stressing the entire absence of evidence regarding any antecedent conspiracy as a mainspring of the disorders.

There is a further difference of opinion concerning the necessity for the imposition and continuance of martial law. The English members think that it was difficult, probably unsafe, not to assume at the time that the outbreaks were the work of a definite organization, and that it would have been imprudent to treat the different occurrences as independent and isolated riots. "In our opinion," they say, "the situation which has arisen in the Punjab was one of extreme gravity, and the authorities were justified in declaring martial law and partially superseding the ordinary tribunals in the different districts to which martial law was applied." They further consider that those responsible for the maintenance of martial law gave careful and considerate judgment, which cannot be criticized, to its continuance. On the other hand the Indian members censure the Punjab Government for assuming the disorders to be a rebellion, and for persuading itself rather easily that martial law was necessary. They state that martial law came into existence when the crisis was past, at a time when the situation afforded no justification for it. They declare that its imposition for preventive and punitive purposes is constitutionally unjustifiable, further objecting to its continuance as wholly unnecessary.

The report investigates in detail the origin and course of the disturbance in various localities. Both Indian and English members are in complete agreement respecting events in Delhi and Bombay, holding that the measures taken by the authorities were reasonable, the minority paying tribute to the conduct of Mr. Barron, Chief Commissioner of Delhi, and Mr. Chatfield, Collector of Ahemedabad. The Indian members are not quite so confident as the English members as to the merits of the restriction placed upon Mr. Gandhi's movements, but they admit the possibility that developments dangerous to the public peace might have ensued from his presence at Delhi and in the Punjab.

Regarding Amritsar, the English members hold that the outbreak was anti-Government at every stage, hostility to the Government quickly merging into antipathy for Europeans as such and culminating on April 10 in the brutal murder of five inoffensive persons and savage assaults on others. The Indian members think that the anti-European sentiment developed subsequent to the firing on April 10, but do not dissent from the view that the firing was necessary. The English members approve the action of the authorities prior to April 13, considering it impossible that de facto martial law could fail to result from the happenings of April 10. But while admitting the difficulties of the situation, they consider that General Dyer's conduct at the Jallianwala Bagh is open to criticism in two respects, first, in that he fired without warning, and second, in that he continued firing too long. They do not believe that the mob would have dispersed if warned, and consider that firing would have been necessary in any case. They consider that General Dyer, through a mistaken belief that continued firing would be justified by the effect produced in other places, committed a grave error in firing too long. They find no grounds for believing that this action saved the situation and averted a second mutiny. But they do not think that General Dyer can be blamed for not attending to the wounded, as they are not convinced anyone was exposed to unnecessary suffering for want of medical attention. This opinion is not shared by the Indian members who, while agreeing in the condemnation of General Dyer's action, take a graver view of the whole incident, stigmatizing his conduct as inhuman and un-British. Regarding outbreaks in other towns of the Punjab, both English and Indian members generally approve the conduct of the authorities, indorsing the action taken at Lahore, Kasur, Gujranwala, and elsewhere. The use of aeroplanes in an emergency so grave is approved, but stress is laid upon the dangers inseparable from their employment and the difficulty of justifying every detail of the action taken. The Indian members emphasize this difficulty, object to certain specific incidents, and further regard as unjustifiable some of the firing done at Chuharkana and Sheikhupura.

In considering the working of the courts set up to try offenders, the English members believe the trials to have been lengthy, detailed, and careful, but regard it as inexpedient not to have sent some of the accused, notably Kitchlew and Satyapal, before the ordinary courts. They note that the necessity for making excessive reductions in the original sentences could have been lessened if in the case of minor offenders charges had not been pressed which, when established, left the tribunals no option but to pass sentences of the severest kind. They think that while the number of persons arrested and detained without being brought to trial was regrettably large, the very difficult work of arrest and investigation was on the whole not badly or oppressively done. The Indian members here differ, regarding the working of the courts and the methods of arrest as unsatisfactory. All members are agreed in commenting unfavorably upon the exclusion of outside lawyers from the Punjab, and in considering that the sentences of flogging were too numerous, having regard to the strong public sentiment which exists in India against corporal punishment.

Regarding the general administration of martial law, the English members regret that it should have assumed such an intensive form, further condemning certain of the orders as in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

judicious and calculated to cause unnecessary inconvenience to the civil population. They object to General Dyer's order that anyone desiring to traverse the street where Miss Sherwood was brutally assaulted should crawl. They also object to the orders passed at Gujranwala and Kasur relative to salaaming. The orders passed in Lahore against students are condemned as unnecessarily severe and serving no useful purpose. On all these matters the Indian members take a more serious view, considering these orders and some others indefensible, unjustifiable, calculated to humiliate Indians, to punish alike innocent and guilty, and to foment racial bitterness.

The Findings of the Indian National Congress Committee

THE following summary of the report of the Indian National Congress Committee was prepared by the editor of *Young India* (New York) from the official text.

When the Hunter Committee's inquiry into disturbances in the Punjab began, the All-India Congress Committee of the Indian National Congress pleaded before the Viceroy of India for the release of the Punjab leaders and all others who had been put in jail without trial in order that they might submit evidence before the Hunter Committee and cross-examine the official witnesses. This the Government of India refused to do. Thereupon the Indian National Congress declared a boycott on the Official Inquiry refusing to cooperate with it by withholding a great mass of evidence in its possession at the time, which forms the substance of a second volume of over 1,000 pages of the report under review. The report is signed by two ex-presidents of the National Congress, by Mr. M. K. Gandhi, the leader of the Rowlatt Act and the Civil Disobedience agitation, and by three other barristers-at-law, all Indians.

The manner in which testimony of witnesses was gathered, sifted, and finally accepted is described as follows: "In every case the witnesses were warned by us of the consequences of making allegations against the officials, and the statements were accepted only when the witnesses adhered to them in spite of the knowledge of the risk they personally ran . . . by reason of exaggeration or untruth." "In most places large public meetings were held and the public were invited to make their statements to us. The nature of the evidence already recorded was placed before the meetings, and those who wished to challenge the accuracy of the statements made were invited to send in their statements even under pledge of confidence if they so desired. No contradiction was received by us." It is on this basis of authenticity that the Report claims, among other outstanding facts, that General Dyer's firing on a mass of people numbering more than 20,000 in Amritsar resulted in "at least 1,200 killed and 3,600 wounded." The Report also records the fact that immediately after General Dyer had finished his "job," Governor Sir Michael O'Dwyer approved of his action which was later indorsed by the Viceroy of India, Lord Chelmsford. The Commissioners have no hesitation in giving it as their judgment that this was "a calculated piece of inhumanity unparalleled in ferocity," and urge the British Parliament to recall the Viceroy, and relieve Sir Michael O'Dwyer, General Dyer, and other officers of any position of responsibility under the Crown.

As an introduction to the whole case of disturbances, the Report mentions the fact that the Punjab occupies a most strategic military position on the map of India. Hence the iron administration of Sir Michael, whose zeal during the war in getting recruits and increasing the amount collected for the war loan is illustrated by the following instance, among many others even worse and more indecent to record.

"The Tahsildar came to our village in the month of Baisakh. At night it was proclaimed by beat of drum that all should present themselves in the morning at the village *daira*. As it was harvest time and also as the people were afraid of being forcibly taken as recruits, only a small number of people attended in the morning. The Tahsildar therefore fined some sixty or seventy persons. The total amount of fine was Rs. 1,600 [$640]. The people were again ordered to present themselves at the headquarters at Gujranwala, which is eighteen miles off. When the people went there on the fixed date, they were made to stand in a row and seven young men were picked out. This was done by Fateh Khan Tahsildar. The other people were abused and beaten and told to bring more recruits."

By these methods, aimed at the terrorization of the people and at the suppression of public opinion, the Report affirms that "Sir Michael O'Dwyer galvanized the Punjab into life and made the Punjabis feel akin in a manner they had never done before." Sir Michael became "stupefied," when in the month of April last "he had an ocular demonstration of the oneness of the Punjab and the oneness of India," and the Report concludes: "We feel tempted to say that he invited violence from the people so that he could crush them."

It was at this stage of tension of public feeling that the Rowlatt bills were introduced and passed in the Supreme Legislative Council of India in defiance of popular opinion throughout India. The Rowlatt Act was described as a piece of legislation providing the accused "with no appeal, no argument, no pleader," and "a martial law without the name," "affecting, not a single suspected person who may be occasionally placed under confinement, but intentionally designed to affect large bodies of people at a time of anxiety and excitement," resulting not in a state of law and order, but of "organized terror and disorder." Mr. Gandhi's Satyagraha movement was organized at this time and a call for Hartal, as a protest in humiliation, was issued and responded to by all classes of people throughout India on two days, March 30 and April 6. Both days passed quietly. Describing the occasion, the Report says: "It was a scene unparalleled in the Punjab, and for that matter in India. On that day [April 6], the leaders and the people seemed to act as one man. There was complete fraternization between Hindus and Mohammedans." Except for this unique power for organizing the popular will in a peaceful manner against the "Black Bills," as they were then termed, the Report affirms that the Satyagraha movement was not responsible anywhere for any violence.

What did produce the violence, however, was the firing on a body of people who were marching to the Police Commissioner's office to demand the release of their leaders, Dr. Kitchlew and Dr. Satyapal, who had been arrested and deported by the Government. Thus Sir Michael's "invitation" of violence by the slaughter of some twenty-five persons was accepted, and his declaration before a Punjab legislative councilor on the eve of the 6th of April, "Remember there is another force greater than Gandhi's," remained to be followed.

General Dyer was now called in to take charge of Amritsar. The first thing that he did after his arrival in the town was to make various arrests. He then issued a proclamation making it unlawful for people to gather in meetings, processions, or in groups of four persons. "There is abundant evidence," the Report claims, "to show that very few citizens knew anything about it," and many of the villagers who had come streaming into the city for the Hindu New Year's Day knew nothing of the proclamation. The Report claims that the meeting held that afternoon was purposely organized by one Hans Raj, who later turned out to be a Government agent, with the view of attracting as large a gathering into the restricted enclosure as possible, and then subjecting them to what General Dyer was disposed to call "the most merciful treatment" by "a rain of 1,650 bullets," according to his own testimony.

After the Amritsar massacre the reign of martial law began. It was enforced in a variety of ways: "(1) The street in which Miss Sherwood was assaulted was set apart for flogging

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people and for making those who passed through it to crawl on their bellies. (2) All were made to salaam, in theory English officers only, but in practice every Englishman, on pain of being arrested and suffering indignities. (3) Flogging was administered, publicly and otherwise, even for trivialities. (4) All the lawyers of the town were made special constables without cause and made to work like ordinary coolies. (5) Indiscriminate arrests were effected of persons, irrespective of status, and during detention they were subjected to humiliations, discomforts, and indescribable tortures for the purpose of extorting confession or evidence, or for the purpose of merely humiliating them. (6) Special tribunals were formed for trying offenses which resulted in gross injustice in the name of law, leaving the aggrieved parties without a right of appeal."

In Lahore the same cruelty prevailed. A body of 500 students in the city were made to carry their bedding on their heads and walk about seventeen miles in the hot summer sun to report for roll call four times a day.

It was in the town of Kasur that the officials seemed to have exercised their full measure of ingenuity in inventing fancy punishments. Some of these were:

(1) School boys and men were whipped, "with no particular object," and "there was no question of any martial law offense." Prostitutes were invited to witness the ceremony.

(2) People were made to mark time and climb ladders.

(3) Religious mendicants were washed with lime.

(4) Those who failed to salute Europeans were made to rub their noses on the ground.

(5) People were made to compose verses in praise of the officer in charge.

(6) Public gallows were erected which were later abandoned.

In all, eighteen persons were hanged in the Punjab during the martial law regime, many of whom "were totally innocent."

Gujranwala was another place where the rigor of martial law was painfully felt. There were mob excesses here in the form of destroying property of the railway station, the church, the post office, and the court-house. The Report condemns this destruction as "wanton and unjustified," but claims that the bombing of the village from aeroplanes by British troops was "entirely unjustified. It was begun after the destruction of the mob was over and the crowds had dispersed."

In other places where martial law was declared women along with men shared the indecent treatment. In Manianwala women were forcibly evicted from their houses and made to assemble near the officer's tent. The women "folded their hands before him, he beat some with his stick, spat at them, and used the foulest and most unmentionable language." He forcibly bared the faces of all the women, and brushed aside their veils with his own stick. He called them "she-asses," "bitches," "flies," and "swine." He kicked them and ordered them to undergo the torture of holding their ears by passing their arms under and around the legs, while bent double.

The same type of outrageous insults were perpetrated in several other towns where martial law was introduced.

"In India it has become too much the custom with the executive and the military," observes the Report, "never to run any risk, or to put it in another way, to count Indian life very cheap."

We quote in full the conclusions arrived at by the Congress Commission.

"(1) The people of the Punjab were incensed against Sir M. O'Dwyer's administration by reason of his studied contempt and distrust of the educated classes, and by reason of the cruel and compulsory methods adopted during the war for obtaining recruits and monetary contributions, and by his suppression of public opinion by gagging the local press and shutting out nationalist newspapers from outside the Punjab.

"(2) The Rowlatt agitation disturbed the public mind and shook public confidence in the good will of the Government. This was shared by the Punjab in a fuller measure perhaps than elsewhere because of the use made by Sir Michael O'Dwyer of the Defense of India Act for purposes of stifling public movements.

"(3) The Satyagraha movement and the Hartal [complete suspension of business] which was designed as a precursor of it, whilst they vitalized the whole country into activity saved it from more awful and more widespread calamities by restraining the violent tendencies of the people.

"(4) The Rowlatt agitation was not conceived in an anti-British spirit, and the Satyagraha movement was conceived and conducted in a spirit entirely free from ill-will and violence.

"(5) There was no conspiracy to overthrow the Government in the Punjab.

"(6) The arrest and internment of Mr. Gandhi, and the arrests and deportations of Drs. Kitchlew and Satyapal were unjustifiable, and were the only direct cause of hysterical popular excitement.

"(7) The mob violence which began at Amritsar was directly due to the firing at the railway overbridge [resulting in a death toll of twenty-five] and the sight of the dead and wounded at a time when the excitement had reached white heat.

"(8) Whatever the cause of provocation, the mob excesses are deeply to be regretted and condemned.

"(9) So far as the facts are publicly known, no reasonable cause has been shown to justify the introduction of martial law.

"(10) In each case martial law was proclaimed after order had been completely restored.

"(11) Even if it be held that the introduction of martial law was a state necessity, it was unduly prolonged.

"(12) Most of the measures taken under martial law in all the five districts were unnecessary, cruel, oppressive, and in utter disregard of the feelings of the people affected by them.

"(13) In Lahore, Akalgarh, Ramnagar, Gujrat, Jalapur Jattan, Lyallpur, and Sheikhupura there were no mob excesses at all worthy of the name.

"(14) The Jallianwalla Bagh massacre was a calculated piece of inhumanity toward utterly innocent and unarmed men, including children, and unparalleled for its ferocity in the history of modern British administration.

"(15) The martial law tribunals and the summary courts were made the means of harassing innocent people, and resulted in abortion of justice on a wide scale, and under the name of justice caused moral and material sufferings to hundreds of men and women.

"(16) The crawling order and other fancy punishments were unworthy of a civilized administration, and were symptomatic of the moral degradation of their inventors.

"(17) The imposition of indemnity and of punitive police at various places, notwithstanding exemplary and vindictive punishments meted out through nearly two long months, mostly to innocent men, and the exaction of fines and illegal impositions were an uncalled for, unjust, and added injury.

"(18) The corruption and bribery that took place during martial law form a separate chapter of grievance, which could have been easily avoided under a sympathetic administration.

"(19) The measures necessary for redressing the wrong done to the people, for the purification of the administration, and for preventing a repetition in future of official lawlessness are:

"(a) Repeal of the Rowlatt Act;

"(b) Relieving Sir M. O'Dwyer of any responsible office under the Crown;

"(c) Relieving General Dyer, Colonel Johnson, Colonel O'Brien, Mr. Bosworth Smith, Rai Sahib Sri Ram Sud, and Malik Sahib Khan of any position of responsibility under the Crown;

"(d) Local inquiry into corrupt practices of the minor officials, whose names have been mentioned in the statements published by us, and their dismissal on proof of their guilt;

"(e) Recall of His Excellency the Viceroy;

"(f) Refund of the fines collected from people who were con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

victed by the special tribunals and summary courts; remission of all indemnity imposed on the cities affected; refund thereof where it has already been collected; and removal of punitive police.

"It is our deliberate opinion that Sir M. O'Dwyer, General Dyer, Colonel Johnson, Colonel O'Brien, Mr. Bosworth Smith, Rai Sahib Sri Ram Sud, and Malik Sahib Khan have been guilty of such illegalities that they deserve to be impeached, but we purposely refrain from advising any such course, because we believe that India can only gain by waiving the right. Future purity will be sufficiently guaranteed by the dismissal of the officials concerned.

"We believe that Colonel MacRae and Captain Doveton have failed equally with Colonel O'Brien and others to carry out their trust, but we have purposely refrained from advising any public action against them, as, unlike the others mentioned by us, these two officers were inexperienced and their brutality was not so studied and calculated as that of the experienced officers.

"M. K. GANDHI, C. R. DAS, ABBAS S. TAYABJI,
"M. R. JAYAKAR."

"Satyagraha"

THE Indian doctrine called "Satyagraha," which formed the basis of popular resistance to the Rowlatt Bills and other repressive measures of the Indian Government, is here described by its founder, Mr. M. K. Gandhi, who was arrested on April 8 by order of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, deported from the Punjab, and interned in Bombay. The statement is taken from the Report of the Commissioners appointed by the Punjab Sub-Committee of the Indian National Congress.

For the past thirty years I have been preaching and practicing Satyagraha. The principles of Satyagraha, as I know it today, constitute a gradual evolution.

The term Satyagraha was coined by me in South Africa to express the force that the Indians there used for full eight years, and it was coined in order to distinguish it from the movement then going on in the United Kingdom and South Africa under the name of Passive Resistance.

Its root meaning is "holding on to truth"; hence, truth-force. I have also called it love-force or soul-force. In the application of Satyagraha I discovered in the earliest stages that pursuit of truth did not admit of violence being inflicted on one's opponent, but that he must be weaned from error by patience and sympathy. For what appears to be truth to the one may appear to be error to the other. And patience means self-suffering. So the doctrine came to mean vindication of truth, not by infliction of suffering on the opponent, but one's own self.

Satyagraha differs from Passive Resistance as the North Pole from the South. The latter has been conceived as a weapon of the weak and does not exclude the use of physical force or violence for the purpose of gaining one's end; whereas the former has been conceived as a weapon of the strongest, and excludes the use of violence in any shape or form.

When Daniel disregarded the laws of the Medes and Persians which offended his conscience, and meekly suffered the punishment for his disobedience, he offered Satyagraha in its purest form. Socrates would not refrain from preaching what he knew to be the truth to the Athenian youth, and bravely suffered the punishment of death. He was, in this case, a Satyagrahi. . . .

This doctrine of Satyagraha is not new; it is merely an extension of the rule of domestic life to the political. Family disputes and differences are generally settled according to the law of love. . . .

I feel that nations cannot be one in reality, nor can their activities be conducive to the common good of the whole humanity, unless there is this definite recognition and acceptance of the law of the family in national and international affairs, in other words, on the political platform. Nations can be called civilized only to the extent that they obey this law.

This law of love is nothing but a law of truth. Without truth there is no love; without truth it may be affection, as for one's country to the injury of others; or infatuation, as of a young man for a girl; or love may be unreasoning and blind, as of ignorant parents for their children. Love transcends all animality and is never partial. Satyagraha has therefore been described as a coin, on whose face you read love and on the reverse you read truth. It is a coin current everywhere and has indefinable value.

Satyagraha is self-dependent. It does not require the assent of the opponent before it can be brought into play. Indeed, it shines out most when the opponent resists. . . .

It is called also soul-force, because a definite recognition of the soul within is a necessity, if a Satyagrahi is to believe that death does not mean cessation of the struggle, but a culmination. The body is merely a vehicle for self-expression; and he gladly gives up the body, when its existence is an obstruction in the way of the opponent seeing the truth, for which the Satyagrahi stands. He gives up the body in the certain faith that if anything would change his opponent's view, a willing sacrifice of his body must do so. And with the knowledge that the soul survives the body, he is not impatient to see the triumph of truth in the present body. . . .

And as a Satyagrahi never injures his opponent and always appeals either to his reason by gentle argument or his heart by the sacrifice of self, Satyagraha is twice blessed; it blesses him who practices it, and him against whom it is practiced.

It has, however, been objected that Satyagraha, as we conceive it, can be practiced only by a select few. My experience proves the contrary. Once its simple principles—adherence to truth and insistence upon it by self-suffering—are understood, anybody can practice it. It is as difficult or as easy to practice as any other virtue. It is as little necessary for its practice that everyone should understand the whole philosophy of it, as it is for the practice of total abstinence.

After all, no one disputes the necessity of insisting on truth as one sees it. And it is easy enough to understand that it is vulgar to attempt to compel the opponent to its acceptance by using brute force; that it is discreditable to submit to error because argument has failed to convince; and that the only true and honorable course is not to submit to it even at the cost of one's life. Then only can the world be purged of error, if it ever can be altogether. There can be no compromise with error where it hurts the vital being.

But on the political field the struggle on behalf of the people mostly consists in opposing error in the shape of unjust laws. When you have failed to bring the error home to the law-giver by way of petitions and the like, the only remedy open to you, if you do not wish to submit to it, is to compel him to retrace his steps by suffering in your own person, i. e., by inviting the penalty for the breach of the law. Hence Satyagraha largely appears to the public as civil disobedience or civil resistance. It is civil in the sense that it is not criminal.

The criminal, i. e., the ordinary law-breaker, breaks the law surreptitiously and tries to avoid the penalty; not so the civil resister. He ever obeys the laws of the state to which he belongs, not out of fear of the sanctions, but because he considers them to be good for the welfare of society. But there come occasions, generally rare, when he considers certain laws to be so unjust as to render obedience to them a dishonor; he then openly and civilly breaks them and quietly suffers the penalty for their breach. And in order to register his protest against the action of the law-giver, it is open to him to withdraw his cooperation from the state by disobeying such other laws whose breach does not involve moral turpitude. In my opinion the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beauty and efficacy of Satyagraha are so great and the doctrine so simple that it can be preached even to children. It was preached by me to thousands of men, women, and children, commonly called indentured Indians, with excellent results.

When the Rowlatt Bills were published, I felt that they were so restrictive of human liberty that they must be resisted to the utmost. I observed, too, that the opposition to them was universal among Indians. I submit that no state, however despotic, has the right to enact laws which are repugnant to the whole body of the people, much less a government guided by constitutional usage and precedent, such as the Indian Government. I felt, too, that the oncoming agitation needed a definite direction, if it was neither to collapse nor to run into violent channels.

I ventured therefore to present Satyagraha to the country, emphasizing its civil resistance aspect. And as it is purely an inward and purifying movement, I suggested the observance of fast, prayer, and suspension of all work for one day—the 6th of April. There was a magnificent response throughout the length and breadth of India, even in little villages, although there was no organization and no great previous preparation. The idea was given to the public as soon as it was conceived. On the 6th April, there was no violence used by the people, and no collision with the police worth naming. The Hartal was purely voluntary and spontaneous. I took no steps to further the idea beyond publishing the following message on the 24th March last at Madras:

"Satyagraha, as I have endeavored to explain at several meetings, is essentially a religious movement. It is a process of purification and penance. It seeks to secure reforms or redress of grievances by self-suffering. I therefore venture to suggest that the second Sunday after the publication of the Viceregal assent to Bill No. 2 of 1919 (i. e. 6th April) may be observed as a day of humiliation and prayer. As there must be an effective public demonstration in keeping with the character of the observance, I beg to advise as follows:

"(1) A twenty-four hours' fast, counting from the last meal on the preceding night, should be observed by all adults, unless prevented from so doing by considerations of religion or health. The fast is not to be regarded, in any shape or form, in the nature of a hunger-strike, or as designed to put any pressure upon the Government. It is to be regarded for the Satyagrahis as a necessary discipline to fit them for civil disobedience, contemplated in their pledge, and for all others, as some slight token of the intensity of their wounded feelings.

"(2) All work, except such as may be necessary in the public interest, should be suspended for the day. Markets and other business places should be closed. Employees, who are required to work even on Sundays, may only suspend work after obtaining previous leave.

"I do not hesitate to recommend these two suggestions for adoption by public servants. For, though it is unquestionably the right thing for them not to take part in political discussion and gatherings, in my opinion they have an undoubted right to express, upon vital matters, their feelings in the very limited manner herein suggested.

"(3) Public meetings should be held on that day in all parts of India, not excluding villages, at which resolutions praying for the withdrawal of the two measures should be passed.

"If my advice is deemed worthy of acceptance, the responsibility will lie, in the first instance, on the various Satyagraha Associations for undertaking the necessary work of organization, but all other associations will, I hope, join hands in making this demonstration a success."

Interesting To Booklovers

At 30 Church Street

Display of rare books and fine bindings brought from England by our Mr. Wilson.

At 55 Vesey Street

Tables of books marked from 10 cents to $2.50. Every book a bargain.

Books Described in this Issue for Sale at Both Stores.

McDEVITT-WILSON'S, Inc., Booksellers
30 Church St. New York 55 Vesey St.
Cortlandt 1779 Phones Cortlandt 498

THE BRICK ROW BOOK SHOP
Incorporated
of New Haven

Announces the opening of its

NEW YORK BOOK ROOMS
at
19 EAST 47th STREET
Opposite the Ritz-Carlton

Visitors will find here good books, old and new, in unusually attractive surroundings.

City Hall at Leipzig

GERMAN CITY BONDS

offer to-day unusual investment possibilities. They can now be bought for a fraction of their nominal value.

Germany has the power to pay and the interest on these bonds is being paid steadily. There is no doubt in the minds of the world that Germany's exchange will return to normal with consequent profit to bondholders.

Correspondence Solicited

von Polenz & Co. Inc.
60 Broadway, New York

Boston Philadelphia Milwaukee Denver Berlin, Germany.

O'HART'S IRISH PEDIGREES
Over 2,000 Pages. ¾ Leather.
1,000 coats-of-arms in colors.

2 Volumes $20.00
D'Alton's History of Ireland (6 vols.) ... $25.00
Atlas of Ireland $6.00
Cabinet of Irish Literature, 4 vols $12.00
Lives of the Saints, 4 vols $15.00
Hidden Phase of American History $5.00
Irish and Catholics in the History of the U. S. (including their part in world war). 2 large vols $10.00

All sent post free

Old and new, rare and standard books on Ireland and the Irish, and by Irish Authors.
CHAS. A. O'CONNOR, 21 Spruce Street, New York City

LABOR LAWS of SOVIET RUSSIA

These laws have been reprinted, with an explanatory introduction, from "Soviet Russia," and are sold to the public at 10c per copy. Other laws and official documents will be reprinted later in similar pamphlet form. Special rates in quantities.

"SOVIET RUSSIA"
110 West 40th St. *Room 304* New York, N.Y.
Are you reading the weekly "Soviet Russia"?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED